

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVII

NOVEMBER, 1948

No. 1

LIFE IN AN ANCIENT IRISH MONASTERY

Martin P. Harney

HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

Sister Mary Consolata Jennings

ABBOT TOSTI, THE LAST OF THE NEO-GUELPHS

Sister Claire Lynch

HOW MANY POPES HAVE THERE BEEN?

Laurence J. Kenny

SOME RECENT BOOKS ON RUSSIA

Anthony F. Czajkowski

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Saint Louis University

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a Year

50 cents a copy

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVII

NOVEMBER, 1948

No. 1

Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN

JASPER W. CROSS

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY

THOMAS P. NEILL

PAUL G. STEINBICKER

HERBERT WEINSCHL

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIFE IN AN ANCIENT IRISH MONASTERY	3
<i>Martin P. Harney</i>	
HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT	5
<i>Sister Mary Consolata Jennings</i>	
ABBOT TOSTI, THE LAST OF THE NEO-GUELPHS	7
<i>Sister Claire Lynch</i>	
HOW MANY POPES HAVE THERE BEEN?	9
<i>Laurence J. Kenny</i>	
SOME RECENT BOOKS ON RUSSIA	18
<i>Anthony F. Czajkowski</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES	22

CONTRIBUTORS

MARTIN P. HARNEY, S.J., A.M., Ph.D., is professor of history, Boston College, and author of *The Jesuits in History*.

SISTER MARY CONSOLATA JENNINGS, V.M.H., A.M., is instructor in history, Visitation Academy, Saint Louis, Missouri. She recently received her Master's degree from Saint Louis University.

SISTER CLAIRE LYNCH, O.S.B., A.M., Ph.D., formerly professor of history at the College of Saint Benedict, Minnesota, is currently Principal of Saint Patrick's High School, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

LAURENCE J. KENNY, S.J., A.M., is professor of history, Saint Louis University, and needs no introduction to readers of the BULLETIN. During its twenty-six years he has been a frequent contributor and in the early days was one of its editors.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI, A.M., Ph.D., is assistant professor of history, Saint Louis University. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the BULLETIN.

Life in an Ancient Irish Monastery

Martin P. Harney, S. J.

Boston College

FROM the time of St. Patrick to the end of the Norse invasions one of the most striking features of the Gaelic world was monasticism.¹ Most of the leading personages were either abbots, abbesses, scholars of the cloister, or monastic missionaries. The scene of their activities, the ancient Irish monastery, deserves consideration. But it is the monastery as it existed before the twelfth century which should be studied; for before that period most of the Irish saints lived and developed a uniquely Irish type of monasticism. After that date Irish monks followed the continental institutes, especially the rules of Cîteaux and the Austin Canons. Also in this later period the convents of the Franciscans and the Dominicans became numerous. This difference between the ancient and the medieval Irish monasticism is emphasized by the monastic ruins. At Glendalough, Clonmacnoise, or in the Arans one finds genuine Celtic structures; whereas at the later Mellifont, Boyle or Muckross one must note the resemblance to the monastic remains of England, France, Germany and Italy.

The environments of the ancient Gaelic monasteries suited very well the eremitical life so favored by the first Irish monks. Remote and difficult spots attracted these holy recluses, for they found in the loneliness and the barrenness sure opportunities for the severe austerities by which they would scour their lives of the worldly dross. Deep-visioned seers, these ardent lovers of God recognized in the lofty towering mountains, in the silent forest depths, in the tumbling surges of the seas, the material manifestation of His omnipotent majesty. St. Suibni sought out a monastery on an island, now known as Skellig Michael, seven miles off the Kerry coast and there on its rocky cliffs, six hundred feet above the restless sea lived his monastic days. Similarly St. Columcille erected one of his houses of prayer on the dark crags of Tory Island, seven miles from the Donegal shore, and St. Enda established his foundations on the Arans, ten miles from the nearest point of Galway. Others constructed their cells on the silent plain or in the depths of the forests, as St. Ciaran at Clonmacnoise and St. Buithe at Monasterboice. Still others found in the remoteness of mountain valleys the ideal spot for contemplation; such were St. Finbarr at Gouganebarra and St. Kevin at Glendalough.

How the surroundings of St. Kevin's lonely oratory conduced to prayer is well described by Dr. Healy: "And for one who loved God and His glorious works, as did St. Kevin, there were never wanting by day or night, sights and sounds to fill his mind with manifold ideas of the attributes of the great Author of all, the majesty of these dark mountains, the changing glories of these lakes and streams, the voices of the falling waters, the roaring of the wintry streams through the wintry hills, Arturus and the Bear rising over the crest of Comaderry, and forever silently sweeping around the changeless pole, the morning sun flooding the dark valley with light—a pale reflection of the splendor of the Great White Throne—these were the sights that met his eyes, and the voices which spoke in his ears during the days and nights that he spent on the rocky floor of the monastic cell."² Disciples crowded into the solitudes of the holy anchorites, forcing them to yield something of their hermit life and to raise up monastic buildings. Yet there never was too great departure from the eremitical ideal; the life was as austere as ever, and in the neighborhood always were to be found the cells of the solitaires.

As the visitor approached the old Gaelic monastery his attention would first have been attracted by the rampart that surrounded it. This great wall, embedded with earth and sods, rose to a height of sixteen to twenty feet and was crowned by a palisade or hedge. To reach any of the four gates, one had to cross a protecting ditch, the width of a moderate road. The gates were of wood, and over some, as at Ardoilean, a wooden cross was affixed. Inside the first rampart, at a distance of seven feet, another earthen wall was encountered; there was even a third at Nendrum. The length of the outer rampart varied from the hundred and fifty feet of the Patrician foundations to the third of a mile at the monastery of Nendrum. Some of the enclosures were oblong in shape, others circular, but the majority were elliptical. These mounds were often walls of the fort which a converted prince donated to the saintly founder. If they did not exist they were built for protection against wild beasts and as a guarantee of solitude.

A little street stretched down the center of the settlement. It was lined with workshops of smiths and carpenters, cattlesheds, granaries, the refectory, guest-houses and the library. At the end of the street stood the chief church; and behind this were grouped the cells

¹ John Ryan, S. J. *Irish Monasticism* (Dublin 1931). This scholarly work, rich in documentation, is the best treatment on the subject; Charles Plummer, ed., *Lives of the Irish Saints*, (Oxford, 1922); John O'Donovan, ed., *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland, by the Four Masters* (Dublin, 1851).

² Abp. John Healy, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 2nd. ed., 1893) p. 418.

and dormitories of the community. All the buildings were small, simple and devoid of decoration, except the church in which austerity was made to yield a bit to artistic devotion. The material of construction was determined by the locality; only where stone abounded, as in the West, were the structures built of stone. Elsewhere wood or wattles and clay were used. Smooth planks, closely and strongly fitted together, were employed in the walls of the church and the larger buildings. The roofs of the minor structures were formed of straw or reeds. If the church were of stone, its roof would be of stones laid in dry masonry as St. Kevin's Church at Glendalough witnessed. The cells of the monks were detached huts of wattles and clay, sometimes round in shape. Where stone abounded, one might find curious beehive-shaped huts, called clochans. The clochan was oval in shape, about nineteen feet by seven and a half, with one entrance; although the Clochan na Carraige in the Aran Islands had two doors, east and west, and a window in the south side. The construction of the stone cells merits consideration. They were built without mortar of any kind; the successive layers of flat stones were made to overlap until the final opening on the top was closed with one or two flat slabs. The stones of each layer were given an outward and downward slope to prevent the rain from coming in. Occasionally clochans were covered with sods to keep them warm in the wintry winds that blew off the ocean. The cells, whether of wattles or stone, varied in size, some accommodated two or three monks, others four to seven. In addition to the chief church, usually there would be in the enclosure one or two smaller oratories. These would be places of special devotion; possibly one might have served as the abbot's private chapel.

The structures of these ancient Irish monasteries were uniformly small, as the measurements of Irish monastic ruins indicate. At Clonmacnoise St. Ciaran's Church is only 12½ ft. long; on the Aran Isles the Teglach Eanda is 24 by 15, the Teampull Bhenan 16 by 9, and the Teampull Mor Mhic Duaigh 18 by 14 in the nave and 15 by 11 in the chancel; at Glendalough the Righ Fearta is 29 by 17 in the nave and 13 by 7 in the chancel, St. Kevin's Church 23 by 15, while the entire length of the Cathedral—a seventh century structure—nave and chancel is only 66 ft. This smallness of the churches and the clochans, and the relative smallness of the caiseals, leads one to wonder how the large numbers of monks were accommodated. The figures for even one monastic settlement seem exaggerated; possibly they included several united foundations. It is known that St. Columban had three monasteries to house about two hundred monks, a fairly large number. St. Columcille ruled a federation which embraced several monastic houses and churches. The cellae attached to the monastery of Bangor were known to be numerous.

The little shops were busy places. In one of them monastic artificers moulded chalices, bells, croziers and crosses, patiently working upon them the delicate, interlaced Irish tracery. In another, the scriptorium, the

monastic scribes not only copied manuscripts and illuminated psalters and missals, but also prepared the vellum and parchment, and fashioned the styluses, pens, the ink and the ink-horns. Adjacent to the scriptorium stood the monastic library, which might have housed a thousand to two thousand books, all encased in finely-wrought leather satchels which hung from pegs in the wall. Not all the shops were within the caiseal, some were located outside the walls; indeed an ancient Gaelic monastery often had the appearance of a small village, surrounded as it was with the shops and cottages of its dependents, hand-workers and farm-laborers.

The dress of the Irish monks consisted in a long, coarse, woollen garment, topped with a hood and reaching to the feet; in inclement weather there was worn a heavy cloak of the same material. The color of both habit and cloak was white: such was the color of St. Columcille's dress;³ such, we may believe, was also the color of St. Brigid's. Most of the monks wore sandals, some even gloves, as did St. Columban, one of the most austere of the Irish saints. Almost a part of the habit was the staff which the Irish monk carried with him when travelling on a missionary journey. The staff was simple enough, just a long smooth stick turned at the top like a shepherd's crook; even the abbot's staff was not a grand affair: the elaborate crozier came at a later date. Great store was set upon this simple staff; often it was exchanged for the staff of another monk as a mark of affection or a seal of a pact of fraternity. The staffs of saintly founders eventually were deeply revered; the staff of St. Ciaran was enshrined in decorated metal work—it is now to be found in the National Museum of Dublin; the staff of St. Patrick was considered to be something so holy as to be called *Bachall Iosa* (the Staff of Jesus).

Ruling the entire community, religious and secular, was the abbot who might also be a bishop, if the monastery were the center of a diocese, as often happened in early Irish Christianity. In the beginning abbots very probably were not elected but chosen by the reigning superior during his lifetime. Thus Columcille named his successor at Iona,⁴ Columban appointed a superior for Luxeuil,⁵ and Enda designated the abbot who was to follow him at Aran.⁶ When the process of election became the practice, the selection was often made from the monks of the same sept; the abbatial dignity of the great monastery of Clonmacnoise, however, was open to all without distinction. The abbot frequently had the assistance of a secretary, as Columcille possessed in Diarmuit, or Columban, first in his countryman, Domael, and later in the Frankish monk, Chagnoald. Even St. Ita employed the help of a young nun.

Of the monastic officials, next in rank would be the *secnab*, or vice-abbot, who held the responsible position of administrator of temporalities. Then would come

³ J. T. Fowler, ed., *Adamnan's Life of Saint Columba* (Oxford, 1894) Bk. II, c. 44.

⁴ Fowler, *Adamnan*, Bk I, c. 2.

⁵ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Ep. III, p. 166.

⁶ Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1910), II, 68.

(Please turn to page ten)

History of Congressional Reapportionment

Sister Mary Consolata Jennings, V. M. H.

Visitation Academy

CONGRESSIONAL reapportionment, or the redistribution of the seats in the House of Representatives among the several states, is a governmental function essential to the maintenance of representative democracy. The continual growth and shifting of population necessitates this periodic readjustment if "rotten boroughs" are to be avoided. The constitution does not explicitly require a redistribution after every ten-year period; nevertheless, it does make a decennial census mandatory. As the constitutional debates reveal, however, the object of the census is to secure the statistical data which constitute the necessary preliminary to reapportionment.¹ The relationship of this function to the legislative branch is obvious; its close relationship to the executive branch through the electoral college is often overlooked.

The history of the reapportionment of the members of the House of Representatives does not reveal the development of any organized plan, nor is there any evidence of an orderly evolution of this phase of American political life. Expediency has been the predominant characteristic of most reapportionment measures; nevertheless, there has always been an undertone of a serious and earnest effort to provide for a sound and equitable redistribution of the federal representatives, in relation to both the number allotted and the method used. This fundamental function has been called the "football" of party politics, and a study of the course pursued by the various Congresses lends credence to the accusation. However, the problem of reapportionment has been rendered difficult by the mathematical phase of the subject, a difficulty which proved much more complicated than was originally supposed. For this same reason, it has been almost impossible to arouse public opinion in support of proposed scientific methods for dealing with the problem, and as a result the argument "ad hominem" is the one more apt to prevail.

The difficulties of the decennial task of reapportioning representatives were aggravated by the very rapid growth of the young republic and the equally rapid admission of new states to the Union; these factors operated to the detriment of the older states which were reluctant to allow a diminution in the number of their representatives. As might be expected, the history of reapportionment reflects the economic, social, and political forces around which the life of a given period revolved. The several apportionment bills therefore fall quite naturally into three large groups, representing three major periods in apportionment history: 1790-1850, a period in which the small states struggled against the numerical superiority of the large states; 1850-1920, a transition period which reflected the rise

of the rural-urban conflict; and finally, 1920-41, a period in which a real crisis in apportionment took place but which terminated happily in a measure of apparently lasting reform.

The struggle between the small states and the large was an extension of the disagreements of the Confederation period and the arguments of the Constitutional Convention. This misunderstanding was augmented by the mistaken notion that the allowance of representation for a fraction of the ratio would not be in accord with the prescriptions of the constitution.² The majority of Congress, for the first fifty years, were evidently oblivious to the fact that forcing a state to bear an excessive defect in representation was certainly less in conformity with the constitution than allowing it to have a slight excess: the procedure of apportioning representatives to the several states "according to their respective numbers" had of necessity to be an approximate rather than an exact equality because of the appearance of fractions, both as regards the ratio and the application of that ratio to the apportionment populations of the individual states. A contemporary issue of this early period was the slavery question. The northern commercial and industrial states increased more rapidly in population because of the great influx of immigrants who were attracted by the opportunities presented in that section. These large northern states used their superiority in numbers to impose their reapportionment plans, regardless of the consequences on the slave states and the small northern states; until 1842 these two groups do not seem to have realized their common grievance. In that year, however, they combined their forces to push through an apportionment bill which was revolutionary in several aspects.³ It gave the small states their long-sought representation for fractions by means of which they obtained proportional equality. It supplied the southerners with a federal statute which made single-member districts mandatory upon the states, and this in turn provided protection for the slave interests by ensuring a political division in the delegations from the northern states. Finally, the two groups engineered the acceptance of a large ratio which radically reduced the House membership and at the same time depressed the power of the large states both in Congress and in political councils.⁴ It seems likely that many of the southerners had in mind the maintenance of the two-thirds rule which seems to have been permanently adopted at the Democratic Convention of 1844. Moreover, if the southern-

² *Annals of Congress*, Vol. 3, p. 59. This idea developed from a false interpretation of Washington's veto of a bill allowing representation for fractions. This was the first time the executive veto was exercised.

³ 5 U. S. Stat. L., 491.

⁴ The weight of senatorial votes increased proportionately as the size of the House membership decreased.

¹ Max Farrand, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, (Rev. ed.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937), I, 557-570.

ers wished to preserve even a partial control of the government, it was necessary for them to act promptly and effectively at that time because any further increase in the number of representatives from New York would have given that state a preponderant vote in all political matters.

In 1850 an attempt was made to provide for automatic reapportionment; by it Congress sought to hold in check the ever-enlarging House membership and to establish the method of distribution before the statistical data of the census was available.⁵ In actual fact, this type of apportionment was successfully used only once, and even then a precedent was set up which later permitted the enlargement of the House membership to protect those states which had suffered a proportionate loss of population. During this whole period from 1850 to 1920, the policy generally followed was that of preserving to each state the number of representatives allotted to it at the preceding apportionment; to this end, the House membership which would accomplish that purpose became the basis of the several apportionment bills. The agricultural-industrial antagonism which increased in violence as the nineteenth century closed was reflected in the above strategy as the rural states strove desperately to maintain their existing assignment of representatives, apparently unmindful or ignorant of the fact that their proportionate voting strength remained the same as it would have been if they had lost a representative or two, and the total membership remained unchanged. The ruralists were aided in this course by self-seeking politicians who sought thereby to protect their jobs and to preserve their district boundaries.

The 1920's saw the literal fulfillment of the words of Representative Vinton, who in 1850 had warned that there might come a day when one of the departments necessary to the passage of a bill would simply refuse to act. Both the Senate and the House were responsible for the default following the fourteenth census. As a result of this failure to reapportion, approximately 30,000,000 persons were deprived of their lawful representation in the House of Representatives during the intercensal period of 1920-30. Furthermore, during this same period two presidents were elected by electoral colleges which were unjustly, if not actually illegally, constituted; however, the number of votes involved would not have affected their safe majorities. This remissness on the part of Congress was rectified in 1929 by the inclusion of an automatic reapportionment provision in the bill providing for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.⁶ Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan was largely responsible for the success of this bill which finally triumphed over congressional inertia and antagonism.

Reapportionment is now on a scientific basis; the membership of the House seems to be permanently settled; and provision has been made to protect this important function from the unscrupulous actions of petty politicians. Automatic reapportionment has suc-

cessfully met at least one decennial redistribution; however, the action of Congress in 1941, when it passed H. R. 2665 (Public No. 291) legalizing the use of the method of equal proportions but making its application retroactive to include the apportionment just concluded, makes it only too clear that all the gains of the preceding twenty years hang very much in the balance;⁷ a precedent of only twenty years or that of only two reapportionments exercises very little influence. The proposed admission of Hawaii or Alaska to statehood could easily prove to be too severe a strain on the precarious existence of automatic reapportionment.

In 1941, Senator Brown of Michigan asserted on the floor of Congress "that almost every reform in apportionment in the history of legislation has been made in the Senate".⁸ The facts of history do not support this statement; in reality, there is considerable evidence to the contrary. In 1812, the Senate insisted on lowering the ratio from 37,000 to 35,000, thereby causing a considerable increase in House membership.⁹ In 1842, the Senate did actually succeed in obtaining a reduction in the number of representatives; it is doubtful, however, whether political reform was the motive behind this action. The matter of districts, which so many hail as a great advance, originated in the House; similarly, the first automatic reapportionment law originated in that body where it had been discussed as early as 1792. It was in the Senate that automatic apportionment suffered its first set-back when a bill was introduced there in 1852 to increase the number of representatives in order to give California an additional member.¹⁰ That the Senate sometimes followed a vacillating course as regards reapportionment is proved by the action of its members on the bill based on the ninth census; at one session the Judiciary Committee proposed an amendment to increase the House membership from 275 to 300, and at the next session practically the same committee sought to reduce the membership from 283 to 243.¹¹ In 1901 when the House Census Committee had introduced a bill which provided for the maintenance of the existing membership, the Senate interfered and demanded an increase. Gillett in 1929 declared:

I remember what occurred in connection with the reapportionment of 1900—and this illustrates the fact that the Senate is not without blame in all the reapportionments. I remember that at the time of the 1900 reapportionment the committee of the House brought in a report recommending that the membership should continue what it was, at 357, and at that time the feeling was general that the House was too large and ought not to be increased in number. The majority of the House was well understood to be in favor of that, but a day or two before the bill was to come up for decision, an appeal was made to the Senate. At that time the Senate was more powerful politically, I think, than it is today. There were members who were called "bosses," and came pretty near controlling the delegations in the House from their respective states. I remember that a few days before the vote was to be taken a few senators issued orders on requests to their state delegations in the House to change their vote, the change was made and the

⁷ 55 U. S. Stat. L., p. 761.

⁸ *Congressional Record*, 77 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 8076.

⁹ *Annals of Congress*, Vol. 23, p. 26.

¹⁰ *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 17 Sess., p. 968.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 42 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 673.

⁵ *Congressional Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 862.

⁶ 46 U. S. Stat. L., 26.

Abbot Tosti, the Last of the Neo-Guelphs

Sister Claire Lynch, O. S. B.

Saint Patrick's High School

"IN the hours of discouragement . . . it was a great comfort to turn your eyes to this old man, always vigilant, always serene, always enthusiastic, indefatigable in his Christian faith and in his Italian faith."¹ So wrote a patriotic Italian journalist shortly after the death of Abbot Tosti, who though not well known today, was recognized in nineteenth century Italy for his historical work and for the prominent part he played in the Risorgimento Movement.

In this paper no claims are made to an exhaustive study of the controversial issues in which Abbot Tosti played a part. I wish rather to present the interesting personality of a man who in spite of his strong individuality, in some respects, may be said to typify one group of Catholic neo-guelphs.

Luigi Tosti was born in Naples in 1811.² His mother died when he was quite young, so he was entrusted to an uncle, a monk at Monte Cassino. The records show that he became a pupil at the school in 1819, entered the Order in 1831, was professed in 1832, and was sent to Rome to complete his studies in 1833. Shortly after his ordination in December, 1833, he returned to Monte Cassino where he taught philosophy and science for twenty years.

About 1829 Tosti became interested in the study of history. The archives of thirteen hundred year old Monte Cassino stimulated him to make this one of the passions of his life. Twenty historical treatises were completed by him,³ and although these works fall short of the standards demanded by modern historical critics, they are certainly not without merit, and were considered valuable by such contemporary scholars as Gladstone, Renan, Gregorovius and Acton.

His study of history gave rise to two ideals which

may be said to characterize his "guelfic loyalty" to the Papacy: the Papacy and Italy, and the Church and Benedictine Monachism. He saw the popes as the fountain head of universal culture and civilization, but as responsible particularly for the greatness of Italy; Benedictine Monachism gave admirable cooperation to the promotion of culture by the civitas. These three forces, Tosti felt, were responsible for Italian greatness. Hence the pope, monachism, Christian culture, and the greatness of Italy were for Tosti notes of the same harmony that he felt sounding within himself. These ideals—which at times seem to have been quite Utopian—permeated his life and were for him a source of ennoblement and grandeur. He was so much the romantic patriot that he found it impossible to detach himself from the present, though he often makes his reader aware that it is his own personal opinion that is being injected by comments such as, "The silence permits me to make a conjecture without presuming to impose my opinion."⁴

In 1842 Tosti produced his *Boniface VIII*, which he dedicated to Dante, correcting that great Italian patriot's views on the civil power of the pope. For Tosti, the papacy had always been the guardian of liberty and especially of Italian liberties.⁵ It was the pope who was the Italians' protector against the barbarians, the Mohammedans, and the tyrannical German rulers. The history of Italy, he felt, was inseparable from that of the papacy, for it was this institution that gave Italy her unique position among other nations.

Several of the other historical works were written while he was active in the Risorgimento Movement; in fact, they were motivated by his desire to direct the course of that movement. Renan, while visiting Monte Cassino in 1849 says, "The old abbey of Monte Cassino has become in the midst of the official barbarism of a country where all who think are suspect, the center of an intellectual movement which is at once complete and original. One finds there a certain elevation of spirit which is not attained except by habit of contemplation . . . Tosti is the most eloquent interpreter of the religious and political tendencies of Monte Cassino."⁶

At another time, when he was describing the horrible degradations in Southern Italy, Renan speaks of the miracle at Monte Cassino which "without doubt better expresses the national spirit of the Italians—it is the center of the most active and most brilliant move-

¹ Jules Gay, "Le père Tosti," *Revue de Paris*, November, 1904, 200.

² The best account of Tosti is to be found in a monograph which appeared two years after his death, written by one of his ardent admirers, Cardinal Capelatro, *Commemor di D. Luigi Tosti* (1899). Jules Gay, "Le père Tosti," in *Revue de Paris*, November, 1904, writes a glowing account of the Italian scholar written on the occasion of the visit made to Monte Cassino by the King of Italy and the German Emperor. An English Benedictine from Downside, Bede Camm, spent several months at Monte Cassino a few years before Tosti died. He has left us some very interesting details about Tosti in the last years of his life, *Dublin Review*, 125, 342-359.

³ *The Story of the Foundation of Monte Cassino* (1842), *Boniface VIII* (1846), *Lombard League* (1848), *Abelard and His Times* (1851), *History of the Council of Constance* (1853), *Story of the Origin of the Greek Schism* (1856), *Countess Mathilda and the Roman Pontiff* (1856), *Life of St. Benedict* (1892).

Tosti biographers say that there was scarcely a scholar in Europe who did not seek out this Cassinese monk, many of them protestants and unbelievers, Gladstone, Renan, Gregorovius and Acton are among the scholars who, having visited him at Monte Cassino, have left us some interesting observations about the Benedictine historian.

⁴ *Life of St. Benedict*, p. 4.

⁵ C. A. "Dom Louis Tosti," *Revue Benedictine*, XV, 55.

⁶ "Dom Luigi Tosti ou Le Parti Guelfi Dans L'Italie Contemporaine," *Essais de Morale et de Critique*, p. 209.

Monte Cassino was located in territory then included in the Kingdom of Naples.

ment of the modern spirit of the country . . . But they have the naive confidence, absent of nuances which characterize first adventures in political life."⁷

Tosti, like many of his compatriots, welcomed the coming of the "liberal Pius IX" in 1846, and from the very beginning took an active part in the national movement blessed by Pius IX. In 1844 Tosti had begun making plans for the review *L'Anteono Italiano*, with the primary purpose of putting the papacy at the head of the Risorgimento. Tosti felt that Pius IX was a pontiff who could unite all the Italians, including the King of Naples, in the crusade for independence. Many of the leading Catholic liberals—Mazoni, Balbo, Cibarior, Troya, Galluppi, Cantu, Gioberti and Rosmini—promised to contribute to this paper. Letters containing a plan of the project were circulated. "Here," says Gregorovius, "in this cloister began the idea of the unification of Italy."⁸

Balbo, Troya and Tosti were of one mind in their conviction that there had to be harmony between the state and the "Keeper of the Keys." Without denying the limitations of the political views of these men, one can see a nobility of soul, a grandeur of spirit reflected in the writings of this group of neo-guelfs. There at the abbey under the benign influence of St. Benedict the Father of Western Monasticism, they wanted a publication printed that would serve as a medium for the best minds of Italian culture. However, the great fame of those invited to contribute to the journal and their known liberalism aroused the suspicion of the government of Naples, and the periodical was forbidden. Soon afterwards the printing press itself was confiscated.

In January, 1848, Tosti went to Rome to encourage Pius IX who was quite disturbed by the conflicts between his national sentiments and his duties as a universal Pontiff. Pius asked Tosti if there was any event in history that would parallel the present conditions. Tosti answered, "Is there not the Lombard League?—I shall write its history and dedicate it to you."⁹ For the accomplishment of his task, Tosti was given access to the manuscripts of the Vatican, but in his ardent desire to finish the work quickly he spent little time in research. He soon returned to Monte Cassino where he worked night and day to complete the work. Although the book itself was not based on any new documents, it is probably the most dramatic of his writings, the work of a poetic patriotic monk, rather than that of a professional historian.

In the prologue, he says he places his work at the feet of the Holy Father and asks him to respond to Italy; for she is demanding to hear his words of blessing on this struggle, undertaken under the eyes of God. Tosti begs Pius IX: "Return, Holy Father, to the standard of Alexander III in the hour of his triumph—the hour has sounded—humanity awaits you. Hasten to bless the solemn union of charity and right

with the power of the keys. The stormy events of humanity, the quarrels of the princes do not trouble you. Your throne rests firmly upon the foundation of hearts enfranchised in the liberty of Christ—if it be placed on the heads of men it falls. . . . In the very essence of the Italian, God has placed the idea of the Roman pontiff. Will you deprive us of so grand a ministry? Will you so honor other people?"¹⁰ He tells Pius that if he were to desert Italy in her hour of trial, he would destroy the union made and blessed by God between Italy and the Roman pontiffs. Before Pius could abandon Italy it would be necessary to awaken from the tombs the princes of the apostles, the 259 successors of Peter, and to tell them that Italy was no longer their home.¹¹

The *History of the Lombard League* was a trumpet call to the neo-guelfs; it was like a torch to smoldering fires throughout Italy. The Naples government was so disturbed by the book that Pius ordered Tosti to suspend its publication. It was during these months, in the spring of 1848, that Pius had publicly announced that although he desired the independence of Italy, he would not wage war against Catholic Austria. Although Tosti had shown the treatise to the pope, Pius had not taken the time to read it before it was published.¹² Tosti was now called to Rome to explain his views, and it appears that there were only a few statements in the prologue which disturbed the pontiff. The monk was not discredited in the eyes of the pope, for, as Tosti said, their conversation was like that of father and child.¹³

Meanwhile, in the fall of 1848, Rossi, the papal prime minister was killed in Rome, Pius had fled to Gaeta, in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the Roman Republic was proclaimed by Mazzini. But Tosti's fear and dismay did not destroy his ardent hope. In December of that year Tosti received the two French cardinals, DuPont and Giraud at Monte Cassino. He pleaded with them to find some peaceful means to assure the pope's return to Rome. They promised to have Comte d'Harcourt, the French ambassador to the papal court, intervene. D'Harcourt asked Tosti many questions relative to the position of the papacy, e. g. Could the pope maintain his power without foreign aid? Could the offices of the civil government of the Papal States be entrusted to laymen? Would there be freedom of the press? Tosti in his vivacious manner answered yes to all these points.¹⁴ Tosti offered to mediate with the triumvirs of the Roman Republic. They consented to receive him, but Tosti's abbot would not let him go to Rome without the consent of the government of Naples. Naples refused and so the project failed.

It was at this time that the printing press at the abbey was confiscated, and in the spring of 1849 a

¹⁰ Renan, *op. cit.*

¹¹ Bede Camm, "Abbot Tosti," *Dublin Review*, 125, 351.

¹² Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ There are a number of D'Harcourt's letters to Tosti in the archives at Monte Cassino. Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, p. 45. (Please turn to page fourteen)

⁷ Letter to Marcellin Berthelot, January 20, 1850, *Revue de Paris*, 1897.

⁸ *Römische Tagebucher*, October 7, 1859.

⁹ Capecelatro, *Commemor di D. Luigi Tosti*, p. 38.

How Many Popes Have There Been?

Laurence J. Kenny, S. J.

Saint Louis University

A GROUP of eminent scholars in Rome has just issued a list of the Popes that differs to some extent from the catalog that has for many years been carried by all the encyclopedias. Their action caused considerable surprise, even dismay, among young historians, not to mention unthinking readers.

Perhaps an investigation of the received roll of American presidents—how many presidents have there been?—may dissipate the wonder awakened by the Roman scholars.

Does not every American child know how many presidents there have been and that George Washington was number one and Mr. Truman number thirty-three?

There can be no doubt that St. Peter was the first pope; but it may be seriously questioned whether Washington was our first president. There were at least, note, "at least," ten men who signed themselves "president" before the inauguration of Washington. No one has ever suggested that any of these were usurpers.

How could Washington be the first president of a nation that came into existence on July 4, 1776, when he did not receive that title until April 20, 1789, thirteen long years later? Surely the United States was not without a head for thirteen years.

John Hancock signed his name with no faltering hand as "president" to that important document of July, '76, that announced the birth of the United States of America, and no one else signed the true original Declaration of Independence, except Thomson, the secretary. A case might be made out that Hancock was really our first president. But not a very strong case, for it is agreed that we were not really a nation until Daniel Carroll and John Hanson, representing Maryland, signed their names to the Articles of Confederation, welding the hitherto thirteen free and independent States into a "Perpetual Union." This momentous signing took place on March 1, 1781. The man who was presiding officer of the Continental Congress on that day was truly president of the United States.

Who was this man? Some old Maryland writers used to maintain that it was John Hanson, and that Hanson was our first president. So recent and exact a publication as the *World Almanac of 1948*, under the caption "Who was our First President," bestows that honor on Thomas McKean of Pennsylvania. But here are the volumes of the authentic *Journal of the Continental Congress* in which it appears that Hanson was only the third, and McKean the second; that Samuel Huntington of Connecticut was president at the date of the signing.

For the record, it may be worth while to list these presidents here, with the dates of their inaugurations. Thus we find that the presidents were:

1. Samuel, Huntington, Conn.....	Sept. 28, 1779.....	p. 1114
2. Thomas McKean, Pa.....	July 10, 1781.....	p. 733
3. John Hanson, Md.....	Nov. 5, 1781.....	p. 1100
4. Elias Boudinot, N. J.....	Nov. 4, 1782.....	p. 708
5. Thomas Mifflin, Pa.....	Nov. 3, 1783.....	p. 799
6. Richard Henry Lee, Va.....	Nov. 30, 1784.....	p. 649
7. John Hancock, Mass.....	Nov. 23, 1785.....	p. 883
8. Nathaniel Gorham, Mass.....	June 6, 1786.....	p. 330
9. Arthur St. Clair, Pa.....	Feb. 2, 1787.....	p. 11
10. Cyrus Griffin, Va.....	Jan. 22, 1788.....	p. 9

So, without counting John Hancock, Henry Laurens of South Carolina and John Jay of New York, who presided after July 4th but before the Perpetual Union was agreed upon, we have ten presidents before George Washington. Some of these gentlemen at times designated themselves as "President of the United States in Congress Assembled." It was a happy phrase and gave our Department of State, when asked to declare who was our first president, an opening by which it was able to reply that George Washington was "the first president under the Constitution." That little appendix "under the Constitution" saved the day benevolently for schoolboys. But let it be observed that the ten enjoyed both legislative as well as executive power whereas Washington and all who came "under the Constitution" were only executives. These ten were certainly presidents of the United States.

But it is curious to observe how lightly they took their high position; they absented themselves from the convention for the slightest cause. It cannot be passed over, in this publication particularly, that Daniel Carroll, the brother of our first American Catholic bishop, was chosen to replace an absentee, and more than once. On the first such occasion, care was taken that he should not enjoy the title "president" while in the chair. Did they fear he might import the pope? It does not seem that any such precaution was taken on two subsequent occasions. Should not the name of Carroll, whom a non-Catholic writer has recently styled "The Unknown Statesman" have been inserted in the above roll of presidents? A Catholic president! This would give us eleven plus thirty-three (if we count Cleveland twice) plus three more, if we are generous enough to include Hancock and company—in all forty-six presidents.

Forty-six presidents instead of thirty-three, and in the thirty-three Mr. Stephen Grover Cleveland was counted twice! Something like this happened in making the list of the popes. In the roll of the successors of St. Peter as given in the *Catholic Almanac of 1947* we find mention of a Cletus and an Anacletus. In the *Almanac of 1948*, which gives the findings of the Roman scholars, we observe that Cletus and Anacletus are the same man. But whereas we repeat Cleveland, thus adding to the presidents, the Romans reject the supernumerary name and at this point shorten their list.

The difficulties that obtain in regard to the presidents are not yet exhausted. Despite the recent aberration of our present judges of the Supreme Court, the American people and their government have always been ceremoniously religious. Sunday is recognized in the Constitution and has always been honored very conspicuously whenever the date for the inauguration of a president fell on that holy day. Zachary Taylor was due to be inaugurated on March 4, 1849. But March 4 in 1849 fell on Sunday, and the inaugural ceremonies were consequently postponed until March 5. This postponement raised a nice constitutional question; who was president of the United States on March 4. Polk's term had expired and Taylor had not taken the oath of office, leaving a vacancy of twenty-four hours. It has been claimed a thousand times that David Rice Atchison was president that one day. A respectable publication, now lying before me, under a list of the presidents, has a note stating that "Atchison was sworn in as president pro tempore from March 3-5." There is no valid proof that he was "sworn in," but despite some rather specious arguments to the contrary, many Kansans, particularly the residents of the city of Atchison, and many loyal Missourians, whom he represented in the Senate, will stand by the statement of the latest *Americana*, "During Sunday 4 March, 1849, he was legal president of the United States.

In 1877, March 4 again fell on Sunday, and again it was not until Monday that Mr. Rutherford B. Hayes, laying his hand upon the Bible, took the oath of office and became president. Little attention was given on this occasion as to who was president on March 4. A great majority of the American people believed that Mr. Samuel J. Tilden had been cheated from taking the oath for the full term of four years as president. It is claimed that Alexander VI and others won their way to the papacy likewise by fraud. But it is admitted, in one case and in the other, that the acquiescence of the people validated the acts of the fraudulent incumbent. He is counted in the lists.

In 1917 Mr. Woodrow Wilson began his second term on March 5, as he succeeded himself, and as an act of Congress in 1886 is interpreted as continuing a president in office "until the next regular inauguration," there was no question here of a one-day president, and there will never be again.

But nothing has been said of anti-popes. Has there been anything like these in American history? An anti-pope is one who is believed by a large section of the faithful to be the legitimate head of the Church. Mr. Jefferson Davis was for four years believed by a large section of the United States to be their legitimate president, and might be designated an anti-president.

This examination of the roster of our presidents should make it clear that it is not to be wondered at that scholars can and do differ as to the succession of the long line of the popes. In fact, a little suspicion of inaccuracy is justified in regard to this new arrangement by the Roman scholars, since after all their additions and rejections, they leave Pius XII just as he was, number 262. By the old count and the new that is

the number of the popes. The presidents are anywhere, you like, between thirty-two and forty-seven.

Ancient Irish Monastery

(Continued from page four)

the cellarer, whose charge was the kitchen and the cellar and whose duty was to see that the food was neither too scarce nor too abundant, in keeping with the rule; and the guest-master, always an important personage in a Gaelic monastery where much emphasis was placed on hospitality to the traveller, the pilgrim, and, above all, to God's poor. The *seniores*, a group of elder monks, were possessed of great dignity; they were brethren of tried virtue to whom were entrusted minor offices of authority, and the direction and correction of the younger religious. At Clonmacnoise a special house was reserved for them. Sometimes the *seniores* were appointed superiors of subordinate and detached foundation, as was the custom at Iona.

The novices and the postulants were of two classes: the youths, who entered the monastery at an early age, and the *conversi*, who in mature life had abandoned the world, perhaps after a life of sin. These latter candidates were subjected to the severest tests to prove the solidity and permanence of their vocation. The younger aspirants were more numerous. Many of them, even as little children, had been offered by their parents for the monastic life—a practice rather common in all medieval monasticism. Such a monastic child was first placed under the care of saintly recluse who would foster him as a son, training him in study and prayer until the time for his entry into the monastery. Sometimes he might have been put directly with the monks to be trained within the monastic walls. In any case he was not permitted to take any obligations upon himself until he had reached maturity; then he made his choice, either to relinquish the idea of monastic life or to embrace it in perpetuity.

Once he was accepted by the abbot the real testing of the applicant began. He was dressed in the habit, the outward sign of his new state; and he was given the tonsure, if that had not already been received in his early years. This last rite was easy enough to bear if the candidate had been weaned from worldly ambitions; but if he were not, it was likely to cause the deepest anguish, for flowing locks were greatly prized by Gaelic freemen and the shaved head was considered the badge of the slave. In the early days of the sixth century, before the monasteries were well established, the candidate might be required to build his own cell; but he would be sure to find an abundance of helpers among the charitable brethren. His spiritual formation was not in the hands of a common novice-master; there does not seem to have been such an official in early Irish monasticism: rather he was expected to learn the ways of religious life from observing and imitating the professed monks. To one of the *seniores* was appointed the task of imparting to him the needful instruction and of seeing that he was in earnest in the practice of virtue. How long the period of probation lasted can-

not be definitely stated; it varied according to the judgment of the abbot as to whether the aspirant had manifested sufficient virtue in enduring the trials and in making the progress requisite for admission to the one vow of stability, i. e. to live as a monk under obedience for the remainder of his days. It was the only vow taken. By it the novice bound himself to a life of mortification and self-denial, to the practices of the virtues, charity, humility, prayerfulness and zeal, and above all to the three fundamental elements of religious life, poverty, chastity and obedience.

Besides the monks three other groups lived in the monastic settlement. First there were the dependents, workmen who assisted the monks in the shops and in the fields; they dwelt in the little huts outside the enclosure. Then there were the hermits who led the eremitical life in solitary cells within the caiseal, or in remote spots of the neighboring valleys and forests. Finally there were the penitents. Great penances still lingered in the Western Church when the Irish monasteries were established. To these havens of prayer penitents were often sent, or came of their own accord, to spend the long periods, even years, of expiation. Not infrequently on the completion of his penance, the penitent remained in the monastery as a monk. More than one such persevered in the hard, rigorous life until at death he was revered as a saint.

The life led by these old Gaelic monks placed great emphasis on prayer, the Mass, the Sacraments and the Divine Office. As elsewhere the very concept of the monk demanded primary occupation with the formal praise of God. The intervals between the periods of prayer were given either to manual labor or to intellectual pursuits, according to the capabilities of the monk and the commands of the abbot. There was little of idleness in the busy, steady hours of the monastic day. A definite time-order would be hard to give, except to say that the day began with the chanting of the morning office before dawn and continued in alternate periods of work, study and prayer until the singing of the evening psalms at dusk brought the long course to a close.

The chanting of the Divine Office was an impressive sight. The abbot, surrounded by the dignitaries of the monastery, occupied a place in the middle of the monastic church; the brethren ranged themselves along the left and right walls, standing during most of the exercises. The chanting was done in a clear, full tone; a fine voice like Columcille's, was much appreciated.⁷ Silence and reverence reigned during the services; and woe to the brother who nodded off to sleep, or who tittered, much less broke out into open laughter, no matter how ludicrously the chanter, or reader, stumbled in note or lesson.⁸ At the completion of every psalm the whole brotherhood bowed profoundly towards the altar. At the conclusion of a set of psalms all knelt during the saying of a collect, thrice repeated softly "Deus in adiutorium meum intende", and then rose again.

Numerous genuflections and prostrations formed quite a distinctive feature of early Gaelic liturgical practice. These Irish monks made much of a choir; less adept at contemplation than the Eastern anchorites, they gave themselves with exceptional zeal to the recitation of the psalms and other vocal prayers.

Mass in the ancient Gaelic monasteries was not celebrated every day, but on Sundays and feast-days, daily during Lent, and on the occasion of the death of a friend. So deep was the veneration for the Mass that preparations for it were started the day before. Judging from the Stowe Missal the differences from our present usages were not very great. At the Consecration the celebrant bowed three times in token of repentance, while the monks prostrated themselves on the ground in profound silence lest a single sound disturb the priest during the solemn moments. Sermons were often preached and, probably, they were long. Together mass and sermon frequently lasted all of two hours; the monks, who had to stand all the time, must have found it trying even to their mortified spirits. In the reception of Holy Communion there were customs different from our modern practices. The communicants made three prostrations on their way to the altar. The Sacrament was administered under both Species; although the Chalice was often withheld from newcomers, because of their inexperience, and from elderly monks, because of their infirmities. One extraordinary custom was the practice of serving the Blessed Sacrament in small vessels for the monks to carry with them when going to work in the fields or in setting forth on a voyage. The greatest purity of heart was sought by the communicants; one of the most glorious encomiums ever passed on St. Brigid is the statement in the Book of Lismore, "she was a consecrated casket for the keeping of Christ's Body and His Blood."⁹

The Sacrament of Penance was in high honor and frequent practice among these ancient Gaelic monks, as is proved by the rules of Iona and Luxeuil.¹⁰ It might be well to note in passing that the Irish monks by softening the great penances of the times contributed to that mitigation which the universal church eventually adopted. Of the many devotional practices in use the veneration and invocation of the saints was greatly cherished by the Gaelic monastic brethren. Ancient rules and chronicles show that St. Patrick, St. Comghall, St. Martin, St. Peter and St. Paul, and above all our Blessed Mother were especially honored.

The monastic day progressed along until the ninth hour—about three in the afternoon; then the first and principal meal was taken, a frugal repast both in quality and quantity. At Iona a second meal, or supper, was eaten at nightfall. The chief articles of food were bread and vegetables, such was the fare provided by St. Comghall at Bangor. Some abbots permitted the use of flesh meat; milk and milk food were of later introduction. The Columban monasteries allowed beer

⁹ Stokes, *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore*, (Oxford, 1890), pp. 50, 198.

¹⁰ Fowler, *Adamnan*, Bk. I, cc. 17, 30; Jonas, "Vita Columbani," *Mon. Hist. Germ., Script. Rerum Meroving.*, 4.

⁷ Fowler, *Adamnan*, Bk. I, c. 37.

⁸ *Regula Coenubialis Sancti Columbani*, Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXX, 217.

as a beverage, wine was not unknown on great festivals. However in regard to drink as well as food the Irish monks were severe rather than lenient, in keeping with the stern penitential spirit of Gaelic asceticism. Two fast days were observed each week, Wednesdays and Fridays, unless these occurred during the Eastertide or fell on a feast day. Three Lents were observed: one for forty days before Christmas, then the regular Lent, and finally a period of forty days after Whitsuntide.

Great stress was laid on the conquest of the spirit. St. Columban wrote a long chapter on mortification, insisting on the internal mortification of the will through obedience. He strongly desired that his monks be guided by prudent elders, lest they fall into errors and extravagances. This was an especially wise course, for all sorts of bodily penances, ascetical practices, curtailment of sleep, long silences and literal acceptance of obedience were assiduously embraced by the Irish monks. Indeed because of its insistence on great austerities the Gaelic monasticism on the continent had to yield to the relatively milder rule of St. Benedict. The lives of these old monks of Glendalough, or Bangor, or Gouganebarra, certainly called for heroic sanctity. If at the same time it was a happy life, the happiness was assuredly that of martyrdom. In an old Irish homily on martyrdom three types are set down: the white martyrdom, by which the monk curbed his body by external austerities; the blue martyrdom by which the monk restrained his will by internal self-denial; the red martyrdom, by which the monk actually shed his heart's blood in testimony of Christ.¹¹ The last was the desire of every Gaelic monk; but as it was seldom within the range of probability, with all his soul he cultivated the first two that he might offer as complete an oblation of himself as possible for the love of God.

Manual labor, since it was looked upon as but another form of prayer, was held in the highest esteem. It was a principle among the old Gaelic monks, "The monks is fed and clothed by the labors of his hands."¹² Some toiled in the fields, ploughing, sowing, reaping, winnowing and transporting; others tended the herds of cattle and sheep. Still others labored at the handicrafts of the bakery, the kitchen, the carpentershop, or the smithy. All had to take their turn at smaller tasks, such as serving in the refectory or cleaning the houses and the churches. Because of the hardships involved these physical labors were eagerly welcomed as opportunities of bodily mortification. St. Enda dug ditches in the sandy soil around his monasteries in the Arans. The abbot and the brethren of Durrow are recorded as having built a house on the depths of winter and as having suffered keenly from the cold. The monks of Iona were wont to carry loads on their backs from the corn fields to the granery, although the monastery possessed a cart and a horse. In a similar penitential spirit some Irish abbots forbade the use of oxen and ploughs in the fields altogether. Since work was the fulfillment of the rule no one was allowed to undertake any task

according to his own desires, nor to employ himself in any labor without the superior's order. Negligence or lack of punctuality were punished; but at the same time inconsiderate eagerness was discouraged. Further the studious were warned not to let their love of books lead them to a disparagement of the toiling of their hands. The very great abbots devoted part of their day to physical labor; thus, as Adamnan writes, St. Columcille never let an hour pass that he did not devote either to prayer, study, writing, or manual work. Only the sick were exempted from the laborer's toil.

The school of an ancient Gaelic monastery deserves special consideration; for it was in such institutions whether in Ireland, England, or on the Continent, that the Irish monks achieved so much for the preservation of learning in the early Middle Ages. This monastic school was not a large imposing building, such as might have been erected in the late Middle Ages, but a small, simple structure. Since much of the instruction was given in the open air, the class-room of these early Gaelic scholars was often the great out-doors of God. The dwellings of the students were all small huts, or cells, and these were arranged around the larger cell of the *Ard Ollamh*, the head teacher. All, whatever was their social rank, were taught and treated alike; and all had to share in the manual labor of keeping the school in order, yes, even of preparing the meals. Not all the students were destined for the cloister; many were the sons of kings and nobles, who expected to follow the career of a soldier or a ruler. Always among the scholars were to be found poor, friendless, but clever lads, eager to accept the free education which the monks were so happy to impart. The Venerable Bede cannot admire too much the Irish monks for giving not only learning, but books and sustenance free to their scholars.¹³ Most of the monks, except the oblati—the little lads dedicated to the monastery, received their elementary education before their entrance. Thus St. Columban learned grammar, rhetoric, geometry and scripture at home. Usually such a boy was taught by a clerical tutor, or a hermit—the last in the case of poor boys. The dangers of knowledge were recognized, but the dangers of ignorance were considered to be incomparably greater. In the Irish monastic world the term, "an ignorant monk", was held to be something of a contradiction.

The subjects taught in these monastic schools embraced Latin, Gaelic, Gaelic history and legends, the writings of the Fathers, the church canons and the liturgy. But above all these, to judge from the esteem in which it was held, was the Sacred Scripture. The doctor of Scripture was ranked with the *ollamh*. It would be difficult to overestimate the place of the Bible in Irish monastic education. Once the boy had mastered the alphabet a psalter, whole or part, was placed in his hands; as soon as he had acquired some proficiency in reading the psalms, he was obliged to commit them to memory. This was to be of great advantage later for

¹¹ W. Stokes and J. Strachen, *Thesaurus Paleohibernicus*, (London, 1903), II, 247.

¹² Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*, I, 131.

¹³ Ven. Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, (Bohn, 2nd ed., London 1869), Bk. III, c. 27, p. 163.

the singing of the psalms during the night hours when the artificial light was very inadequate. It is not well known what aids, in the shape of vocabularies and grammars were to be had; in later ages they were abundant. After the psalms other portions of the Sacred Scriptures, especially the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul, were read and memorized. Such was the progress which the young Columban made that while still a young man he composed a pleasing Latin treatise on the psalter.

One intellectual labor the Irish monks held to be truly an apostolic work, it was the copying of manuscripts. How much does the world owe them for their preservation of the Scriptures, the Latin classics and the writings of the Fathers? The task of copying was carefully and painstakingly executed. It was done with pens and ink, or colored pigments, upon vellum or parchment; the binding was in the form of the book as we have it today. Such masterpieces of illumination as the *Book of Kells*, or the *Book of Durrow*, show how beautiful could be the work of these ancient Irish copyists.

The daily life of the Gaelic monk in prayer, austerity, labor and scholarliness has been considered. At length the day of his departure from this life came. Having confessed he waited in calmness and confidence for the end. With solemn ceremonies the Holy Viaticum was administered to him, the abbot always reserved this sacred task for himself. Then the dying monk, if able, spoke a farewell word to his brethren assembled and intoned himself, the antiphon for the departing soul. The community crowding around the bedside sought to aid with their prayers the departing brother in his last agony. St. Ciaran of Clonmacnoise, when the hour of his decease was approaching, "commanded that he should be carried outside his cell. Looking up to heaven, he said, 'Hard is the way, and yet this needs must be.' To him the brethren said, 'We know that nothing is difficult for thee Father, but we, unhappy men, must greatly fear this hour.' And being carried back into the house, he raised his hand and blessed the people and the clergy. And lo, angels filled the way between heaven and earth, rejoicing to meet St. Ciaran."¹⁴ When the final moment of the dying brother had come and gone, there were few tears, for that day was reckoned his natal day in Heaven. And truly it was so. In hardships and in heroism he had fought the good fight, the crown awaited him in Heaven.

¹⁴ Plummer, *Vitae Sancti Hibern.*, I, 215. A similar account of St. Ciaran's beautiful death may be found in Stokes, *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore*, p. 132, 1.4450, also p. 278, 1.4450.

Congressional Reapportionment

(Continued from page six)

comfortable majority in favor of keeping the membership as it was then, was changed and the membership was increased from 357 to 390.¹²

Neither house can claim all the laurels: both must share the shame and the encomiums which are due to

¹² *Congressional Record*, 1 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 1843.

the builders of the apportionment bills through the succeeding decades: both have had strong, fearless, far-sighted men, and both have had members too narrow and shortsighted to be worthy of the title of congressman.

The subject of congressional districts has become so interwoven with that of apportionment that it is almost impossible to discuss the one without the other. Single-member districts are a part of the American tradition; they have formed a part of the legal framework for the greater part of the past century. Consequently, it would not be out of place to discuss their value. Most of the members of the House can be elected by a vote of 150,000 or less, that is approximately one-tenth of one per cent of the total population can send a representative who constitutes one-fourth per cent of the total membership of the House. In actual fact many, if not most, of the representatives receive a vote considerably smaller than the number mentioned above. What have been the results of this policy? In general, the American people have had provincial minded representatives, willing to act as errand boys for their constituents and catering to local demands at the expense of national aims and interests: the representative who must face the ordeal of re-election every two years is forced to devote a large part of his time and talent to the important job of getting and keeping votes. Consequently, few of the men best prepared for a life of public service have been willing to expose themselves, their families, and their careers to the hazards of the political arena: public service in the House of Representatives can hardly be called a career in the United States.

It has been asserted that the American people get a real presidential leader only by chance: that is, since the big political parties are interested in victory primarily, they pursue a safe course and choose a man who has not had a too colorful career behind him, one which his opponents might twist and turn to their advantage.¹³ Much the same idea can be applied to possible candidates for the House of Representatives. Perhaps the general ticket would have more readily lent itself to the development of real leaders; to this, it may be objected that minority groups would have no opportunity for expression. This may be so: the good of these small groups is important, but it should not be so exaggerated that it becomes detrimental to the good of the whole. Furthermore, if a real minority group does happen to elect a representative, what actual service does he render? If he is not a member of one of the major parties, he has hardly an opportunity to accomplish anything constructive; if he is an expert parliamentarian he may make himself feared by his obstructive tactics, but rarely is any permanent good accomplished in this manner.

Are the individual states too large to serve as federal districts? This seems to have been the plan in the minds of at least some of the founders of the Republic, and

¹³ Edward Sait, *American Political Parties and Their Elections* (3d Ed.; New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1942), pp. 573-80.

certainly there would be greater proportional relationship between the federal and state districts if this plan were used. Both the general ticket system and that of proportional representation, the plan advocated by the National Municipal League, are clumsy in operation; yet, if constructive thinking were pursued along these lines, could not many of the difficulties be eliminated as they have been in the development and application of the various mathematical formulae to congressional reapportionment? Some provision should be made, in the meantime, for the election of representatives in metropolitan areas: community of interest is not likely to be determined by a block or so. To a certain extent, urban population is a moving population, but a great deal of this transfer of residence takes place within the city itself. Representatives should be assigned to a metropolitan area according to the population and then elected at large for that area; these representatives would be more apt to maintain a longer tenure of office and would thus be able to build up the seniority necessary for the leading positions of Congress.

In 1931, Representative Clancy of Michigan, while rejoicing over the first successful application of the automatic apportionment law of 1929, declared that thereby the rural-urban conflict had been removed from the halls of Congress.¹⁴ He went on to say that this would help to prevent the mobilizing of these two antagonistic economic and social forces. To a certain extent this conflict has been removed from Congress, but in much the same manner that the troublesome question of slavery was removed in pre-Civil War days: it is being avoided. The two major parties make it their policy to ignore disrupting issues; they leave the settlement of such questions to the various pressure groups which often perform the valuable services of teacher and publicity agent at the same time. It is only after a fairly general sentiment for a particular policy or mode of action has been created that the two political parties will sponsor a definite solution. Some declare that if this course of action had been allowed to mature, the "irrepressible conflict" would never have taken place. That, of course, is mere supposition; nevertheless, it does seem that the same technique is being applied to the rural-urban problem of the present day. However, some rather disastrous effects are resulting from this prolonged tolerance of a maladjusted balance of political power. The ruralists are entrenched in the state legislatures, and as a result have a dominant voice in political councils besides controlling state policy and expenditures. As a rule, rural legislators have no understanding of urban problems; as a consequence, the cities have been forced to seek assistance, not in the state capital, where it should be sought, but at Washington: this was only too evident during the depression crisis of the 1930's. The rural-urban conflict has been one of the chief causes of the decline of the state governments, which are essential administrative units in the American plan of government. As one author has stated: let the state governments disappear and the federal government, having become a huge bureaucracy, will eventually

collapse of its own weight.¹⁵

The democratic form of government is definitely facing grave dangers, dangers that threaten its very existence. Recognizing this situation, political scientists are publishing articles pleading with the American people to develop some understanding and appreciation of the truly tremendous job that confronts a man when he assumes the office of representative. The history of congressional reapportionment furnishes ample evidence that the privilege of being a member of the House of Representatives carries with it many burdens and strains, and that many of the House members are good, honest, sincere Americans conscientiously seeking to do their duty. The present state of apportionment provides another instance in which the American people have, more or less, blundered through to success, but as usual they have had to pay rather dearly for their experience.

¹⁵ T. A. Perkins, "State Legislative Reorganization," *American Political Science Review*, XL (1946), 510-21.

Abbot Tosti

(Continued from page eight)

Neapolitan regiment appeared at Monte Cassino in search of the liberals who were said to be guilty of revolutionary propaganda, rationalism and pantheism. Tosti received orders to flee within twenty-four hours. Rosmini was allowed to remain, but was put under strict guard.¹⁶ Abbot Papalettre and his brother were imprisoned in Naples where they remained for several months. A very strict police surveillance was then maintained over Monte Cassino. Gregorovius, who visited there in 1859, points out the fact that a ministerial decree from Naples stipulated that every monk who left the abbey had to obtain a permit indicating where he was going and the purpose of his journey.¹⁶

Meanwhile Tosti was hiding in the Benedictine monastery at San Severino in Naples. Although Tosti was accused of belonging to a band of conspirators, it appears that the police guarding the monastery very good naturedly allowed the "conspirator" to come and go freely from the monastery. Tosti, however, was paralyzed with fear. As one writer says, "He united audacity of thought, a burning ardor in theory, with a personal timidity which amounted to cowardice."¹⁷ He sought refuge first in the home of an Englishman living in Naples, and later with Temple, the English ambassador. The latter told him he would use his influence to obtain for Tosti the Chair of History in the University of Manchester. For his immediate security Tosti was offered passage on the English ship *Porcupine* bound for Smyrna. When Tosti heard of its destination he was horrified and said, "No, never will I trust myself to a *Porcupine*, still less go among the Turks! No, rather a prison at Naples."¹⁸

Shortly after this Tosti met Pius IX at Portico. The pope is said to have been much amused at the monk's exaggerated fears. After trying vainly to convince the

¹⁵ So says Renan in his letter of January 20, 1850, *loc. cit.*

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, October 6, 1859.

¹⁷ Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

¹⁸ Capececiatro, *op. cit.*, p. 48. It was during this time that he wrote his *Commentary on the Bible* and the *Treatise on Abelard*.

¹⁴ *Congressional Record*, 71 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 6884.

Neapolitan government that Tosti was not a dangerous conspirator, Pius offered Tosti two alternatives, a decree of secularization or a ban of exile. The first Tosti rejected as unworthy of himself and the pope, so he accepted the latter and lived in exile, dividing his time between Rome¹⁹ and Florence.

When he returned to Monte Cassino in 1850 he remained under the very strict surveillance of the abbot until 1860. Tosti speaks of these years as *decenio plumbeo*—a leaden decade. Gregorovius visiting him here in 1859 describes him thus: "A profound and beautiful soul dwells in this extraordinary man. Everything with him is intuition, he works and studies very little; everything is created within himself. He laughs heartily when he talks, the laugh of a happy disposition that has never known the torments of ambition. Nevertheless in his looks there is something of superior sagacity that suddenly reveals the prince of the Church. It is the inherited spirit of the Benedictine aristocracy that dwells within him."²⁰

Tosti at this time conceived the idea that he would ask the aid of foreign powers in restoring the crypt of St. Benedict. He wrote to the Emperors of France and Russia, the King of Naples, the Queen of Spain, Queen Victoria of England and Gladstone. It did not seem to perturb him that he was making appeals to protestants and others very ill-disposed towards monasticism. Gladstone responded with 100 ducats and the answers of the sovereigns, though in general benevolent, were insufficient to finance the undertaking.

The Siccardi Laws of the Turin Parliament and the confiscation of religious property in the years 1859 and 1860 aroused Tosti's ardent patriotism again. When the first decree regarding the confiscation of monasteries and convents was promulgated he prepared a pamphlet, *St. Benedict to the Parliament*, as if St. Benedict himself were pleading with the Sardinian parliament. He cited with great eloquence the role of the Benedictines in the national movement in 1848 as well as throughout the entire history of Italy.

Leave a refuge for Italy, bereft of so many of her children, by imprisonment, exile and war. Let her lay her head on the bosom of our psalmody. With these chants we sang her lullaby when she was yet in her infancy. The soldier, the workman, the business man, all have their place in your citizenship. Shall the man of prayer alone be an alien in a land of Catholics? Leave us to our prayer for prayer is the bond of our society and of our labor; it is our trade. For it we are monks, for it we shall ever be with you, for St. Benedict longs to remain here with his own Italy.²¹

The delegates to the parliament could not help being impressed by the words of this ardent patriot, but they were determined on the enrichment of the state by means of the spoliation of church property.

Tosti, like Rosmini, Gioberti and other neo-guelfs in the first decades of the nineteenth century, thought of unifying Italy in a confederacy under the pope at Rome. Although Rosmini and Gioberti changed their

views considerably, the naive monk never seemed to fear the radical Italian patriots as much as he did his fellow neo-guelfs. He seemed very optimistic about the new generation. One might say he was ahead of his age in his insistence that the papal states be a model for all other Christian states, one in which there was an adaptation or a harmonizing of modern political liberal ideas.²² Throughout his life, Tosti retained this dream of an intimate union of Christian princes with the church, of a political union of the papacy with a free and liberal Italy.

He, like many of the neo-guelfs, resented the presence of the "Foreigner" in Italy as a protector of Peter. Tosti could not forgive the early ninth century Italians for uniting with the Carolingian dynasty. The creation of the Empire was to him an immense catastrophe: "With one hand was placed the crown of gold on the foreigner and on the poor Italian a crown of thorns."²³ Tosti always remained true to the ideal of municipal autonomy, and identified with despotism the artificial unity imposed on Italy by the foreigner.

After the stirring events of 1848, there was a wane in the federalistic activity, and Tosti realized that the guelf movement was separating itself more and more from the papacy. He continued nevertheless to correspond with men in high political places, hoping to steer the Risorgimento in the right direction. He visited Pius IX frequently after the latter's return to Rome in 1850. The pontiff often benevolently scolded the monk for his unbridled enthusiasm, but this did not mar their very cordial relations.

After the Sardinian government's seizure of papal lands in 1860, Tosti like many others thought of a collective guarantee by all Catholic powers for the Patrimony of Peter. By 1861 this project no longer seemed feasible to him. Meanwhile Prime Minister Cavour was carrying on his secret negotiations with his aids in Rome, Dr. Pantoleoni and the ex-Jesuit Passaglia. Cavour used these men as intermediaries between himself and different cardinals whom the Prime Minister considered to be liberal in their views on the "Roman Question." Tosti likewise was in communication with some of these cardinals. Tosti proposed a solution to the "Roman Question" which is remarkably similar to that outlined by Pantoleoni.²⁴

For the restoration of church property, Tosti did not favor an annual fee to the pope, but instead he advocated that the pope be given the complete title to all church property. This in the mind of Tosti would be sufficient guarantee of the pope's liberty of action in regard to the state as well as to the church. It was

²² Capecehatro, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

²³ Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

²⁴ Pantoleoni was antipapal while Passaglia considered himself a faithful Catholic, though insisting on the reform of the government of the papal states. Cardinal Santucci and D'Andrea were among the cardinals with whom negotiations were carried on. Both of these cardinals were likewise in correspondence with Tosti. Cf. S. W. Halperin, *The Separation of Church and State in Italian Thought from Cavour to Mussolini* (1931), 11-17, for an account of the memorandum Pantoleoni presented Cavour. Also F. Engel Janosi, "Two Austrian Ambassadors Discuss the Successors of Pius IX," *C. H. R.*, XXX, 9-10.

¹⁹ Renan visited him in Rome and described him as being happy and resigned in his thoughts, but, he thought, without hope. Other authorities on Tosti do not give the impression that Tosti ever despaired or relinquished his dream of the reconciliation of the Church and state.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, October 15,

²¹ Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

Cavour's "free church in a free state." The government would thereby be freed from the crime of robbery, for it would take from the Holy Father only his political power, "incompatible with this age." In this way Tosti thought a reconciliation possible by distinguishing between the temporal-political and the temporal-spiritual, "the first is of former times, the second is more fitting for our times."²⁵

The agonizing struggle of conscience felt by patriotic Italians who likewise wanted to remain true sons of the church is illustrated in a letter of Tosti in which he described his conversation with Nigra, a minister of state. Tosti believed in the sincerity of Nigra when the latter spoke, not officially as a minister of state, but personally as an Italian Catholic. Tosti wept with him at Nigra's sorrowful words, "Is it possible that our Holy Father has no mercy for the agony of our conscience, or does he believe that we are no longer sons of the church. If he could see our hearts it would grieve him more than do the events of our times . . . Why doesn't the pope open his arms and welcome us, the sin isn't our sin? . . . The Holy Father need have no fear of the Italians, for their hearts still contain the Faith which is less of a hazard than the protection of one who is not of our Faith."²⁶

Nigra and other of his friends wanted Tosti to go to Rome, but Tosti wrote to Cardinal Santucci putting the case before him saying that, if the cardinal deemed it wise, he might submit the letter to the Holy Father, adding "I will not go to Rome without the express permission of the Holy Father. Otherwise I will stay here with my prayers."²⁷

The death of Cavour and the marshalling of the anticlerical forces in Turin where the Sardinian monarchy was transformed into the Kingdom of Italy in 1861 ended all these negotiations²⁸ for a solution to the "Roman Question."

In 1866 when the Italian parliament was discussing further confiscation of religious property, an amendment was prepared to exempt Monte Cassino from the decree. Tosti multiplied his letters to his friends and scholars in France, England and the German states. He pleaded with them to help save Monte Cassino in the interests of science and out of respect for history. Gladstone, a long time admirer of Tosti, was very much disturbed by the thought of Monte Cassino being destroyed.²⁹ He interceded with Prime Minister Ricasoli and also wrote a spirited letter to the influential Neapolitan Sir James Locaito: "It seems as if one of the lamps of learning were put out; much promise for the future extinguished; and a sacred link of union with

²⁵ Letter to Nigra, March 25, 1861. *La Questione romana negli anni 1860-1861 Carteggio del conte di Cavour*. This separation of the temporal and spiritual power of the papacy was the basic argument of such liberals as Passaglia, who claimed that the pope had no need of temporal power in the nineteenth century.

²⁶ Letter to Cardinal Santucci, April 4, 1861, *Ibid*.

²⁷ *Ibid*.

²⁸ Some historians maintain that Cavour's efforts were a veritable blue print for the Lateran Treaty of 1929. Cf. F. Engel-Janosi, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

²⁹ Gladstone and Lord Acton had visited Monte Cassino and both remained life-long admirers of Tosti. R. DeCesare, *Last Days or Papal Rome*.

the past broken . . . the foundation and history of Monte Cassino . . . are a part of the great current of Italian civilization which has been diffused and distributed all over European lands . . . I cherish the hope that the enlightened mind of Baron Ricasoli and his colleague may lead them either to avert or mitigate this blow."³⁰

Through Gladstone's intercession an official petition from the Institute of Archaeology of London was sent to the Italian Government. Tosti himself went to Florence, now the capital of Italy, to interview some of the members of parliament, and he finally succeeded in having Monte Cassino made a national monument with the monks themselves designated as the official custodians of the abbey.

After the death of Cavour in 1861 Tosti seems to have taken no active part in political events, but one may assume that he was sorely grieved at the confiscation of all papal territory except Rome after Garibaldi's march in 1867. The approaching marriage of Prince Humbert in 1868 seemed however to Tosti a propitious moment to try once again to reconcile the two powers. He then worked out a plan whereby the pope would give to the king the vicariate over the papal states already occupied by the Italian government while the pope himself would retain the actual sovereignty over the territory. Rome was to be governed by the pope as the capitol of Christendom, but must serve at the same time of the nominal capital of Italy. Tosti, like many other Italian liberals, felt the fascination of Rome as the capitol of the nation: "Rome the capitol of the world and at the same time the Reception Hall for all the great feasts of Italy."³¹

Tosti envisioned Monte Cassino as the place for this reconciliation, where the hereditary prince would come and beg the pope for Papal benediction. Prejudice, passion, and bitter partisan strife prevailed, and the good monk's dreams were never realized.

For another twenty years, even during the seizure of Rome by the Italian Government in 1870, Tosti took no direct steps for the attainment of his ideal but continued his correspondence with princes, cardinals and ministers of state. Furthermore he offered himself as a mediator between the government and the popes whenever the latter desired his services. Through Tosti's efforts several monasteries, including Grottaferrata and Sacro Speco of Subiaco, were saved from spoliation.

Several incidents occurred in 1887 to enkindle Tosti's hopes for a reconciliation between the Papacy and the Italian government. First there was the approaching Jubilee of Leo XIII. Tosti was grieved to think that Italian Catholics would be excluded from this celebration. Then there was the incident at Florence at the ceremony of dedication of the new facade of the cathedral, when the archbishop blessed the king and queen. It was the first meeting, after sixteen years, of the king with a high dignitary of the church, and Tosti was filled with great hope. Finally Leo XIII had just waged a successful war against the German

³⁰ John Morley, *Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, II, 218-219.

³¹ Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

government; the Kulturkampf had left the Church in Germany stronger than before. Tosti envisioned another diplomatic victory for Leo. In a consistory on May 23, the pope expressed his earnest desire to make peace with Italy.

This nation which God has joined by such close bonds to the Roman See and which nature herself recommends in such a special manner to the affection of our hearts. We most certainly (as we have taken occasion to say on more than one occasion) for a long time have most eagerly desired that the hearts of all Italians should join together to obtain security and peace, and that the fatal discord with the Holy See should be utterly done away with, but always saving the rights of justice and the dignity of the Apostolic See . . . We mean that the one and only way to obtain concord is the condition that the Roman Pontiff should not be subject to the power of any one, but should enjoy full and true liberty, as every reason of justice demands.³²

This invitation was received by the Italian government in sullen silence, though it aroused the world as well as the Sacred College. The allocution was published immediately in Italy and the rest of Europe. Many were convinced of an approaching peace, saying that a pope with such shrewdness would not have uttered these words if there were not some secret negotiations in progress. But the truth of the matter is that Leo's paternal heart was merely couching in very delicate terms his plea for reconciliation.

At this time, Tosti, a *persona grata* at the Quirinal as well as at the Vatican, was with the pope's permission negotiating with the government for the restoration of the revenues of the Basilica of St. Paul Outside the Walls and several other churches. He was always hoping that these projects would pave the way for a solution to the "Roman Question." Crispi, the prime minister, led Tosti on, taking every word about the conciliation that the monk uttered from the innocence of his heart as if it had the authority of the Vatican behind it.³³ The allocution roused Tosti to an indescribable excitement. He was now seventy-six years old, but he became young again and gave himself up to one of his greatest flights of imagination in a brochure *La Conciliazione*.

This anonymous pamphlet in the form of a dialogue appeared on May 31. A pious and zealous curé Dom Pacifico discusses contemporary events with his bishop. The curé tells his bishop what the pope should do, namely, he should surrender his temporal power for the sake of peace. The "Roman Question," that is, the restoration of papal lands, was not feasible, in fact impossible for the Italian government.

Today princes reign but do not govern; the custody of the laws is in the hands of the whole people; the government belongs to the nation, and if there are things evilly acquired, the Pontiff may express his sorrow to those who seized them, but he cannot demand of the prince that they should be restored. On this account the King of Italy if asked to restore Rome to the Pope, cannot accede, because Rome is not his. He would be obliged to reconquer it by force, drag it from the hands of the nation.³⁴

The curé preached pardon and forgiveness. These were the means to smooth away all difficulties. Provi-

dence will supply the guarantee to earthly power to those who give filial charity to the whole nation. "We will see the Sedia triumphantly carried on the shoulders of thirty million Italians and these robust shoulders will raise it so high that no conflict can affect it."³⁵

The brochure raised a tempest among the intransigents in Europe as well as in Italy. There was not a newspaper in Italy that did not publish it. Some said that the reconciliation had been accomplished, while others spoke of the "Pontifical Canossa" and the "New Avignon Captivity." From France and Austria came threats of schism. There were many who were convinced that the pope had directed Tosti to write the pamphlet, for it was said "Even the proof sheets had been seen by Leo." In spite of Tosti's flat denial that Leo XIII knew anything about his *La Conciliazione*, Crispi persisted in the belief that the allocution and the pamphlet were both part of the diplomatic strategy of the Vatican.³⁶

This was another instance when Tosti's naive patriotism seemed to jeopardize the cause of reconciliation, for it made it impossible for Leo XIII to take any further steps in his negotiations with the government.³⁷ The pope, while not condemning the idea of reconciliation, was disturbed by the unseasonableness of the pamphlet and asked Tosti for a retraction. Tosti submitted immediately, but his first letter being somewhat vague, he was asked for a more complete statement. The second letter was a complete repudiation of all views which were unacceptable to the pontiff. Tosti had been assured that this letter would not be published, but due to pressure from all sides Leo XIII deemed it advisable to let the public know that the strange proposals were condemned. Some of the papal advisers, including Cardinal Bartolme, wanted Tosti severely treated, but the pope refused to administer any further penalties. Tosti was heartbroken, for he seemed condemned on all sides. It was a great sorrow to him to be accused of being an enemy of the pope and Italy; "I have devoted all my life to the love of these two."³⁸ Tosti, however, held no shadow of rancour, but retained a strong affection for Leo XIII,³⁹ following the activities of his pontificate with great interest.

Despite several misunderstandings, due to Tosti's naiveness and imprudence in expressing what at times amounted to dangerous "liberal ideas," he remained on

³⁵ G. Mollat, *La Question Romaine, de Pie VI-Pie XI*, (Paris, 1932), p. 383.

³⁶ In an article appearing in the *Contemporary Review*, August, 1891, Crispi says Leo XIII had read and approved of the brochure before it was published. The whole story of Tosti's political activities will not be known until his letters, now in the Vatican archives are open to the public, but a recent study has been made by Vanna Fedele, "Leone XIII E L'Abate Tosti" in *Nuovo Antologia*, April 16, 1934, 562-578, in which the writer states that although there is no proof that Leo knew anything about the brochure before it appeared, the pope probably agreed with some of Tosti's ideas.

³⁷ Benedetto Croce, *History of Italy (1871-1915)*, p. 176, says the Jesuits and Freemasons worked against the reconciliation.

³⁸ Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, 356. Leo XIII refused to deprive Tosti of his position as sub-archivist. Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

³⁹ In 1896 when Leo XIII was working for a reunion of the Anglican Church, Tosti wrote hopefully to Gladstone. Cf. Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-359.

³² Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

³³ S. W. Halperin maintains that although Crispi was an avowed anticlerical, he was desirous of showing his mettle as a statesman and outdistance all his predecessors by establishing peace between the two ancient foes. "Italian Anticlericalism 1871-1914," *Journal of Modern History* (March, 1947), 18.

³⁴ Crispi, "Italy, France, and the Papacy," *Contemporary Review*, August, 1891, p. 169.

friendly terms with the reigning pontiffs, Gregory XVI, Pius IX and lastly Leo XIII. Gregorovius said that shortly before Gregory's death the pope had planned to make Tosti a cardinal. Capecelatro confirms this by stating that all three popes considered Tosti for the cardinalate but that the monk's political views deterred them from doing so. The indulgence shown Tosti by the popes might lead one to conclude that probably Tosti's "liberal views" were really not so incompatible with those of the popes as they were to the political ideas held by some of the pontiff's advisers among the cardinals.⁴⁰

The last ten years of his life, until his death on September 24, 1897, Tosti lived at Monte Cassino in quiet retreat from political affairs. He was occupied primarily with monastic problems and again threw himself into the project of the restoration of the crypt of St. Benedict.⁴¹ He retained to the end of his life a youthful ardour. "To have the entree of his room was one of the greatest privileges of a six months' sojourn at the famous abbey," said an English monk in describing Tosti during these years.

The old man sitting before his table with his breviary and his snuff box in front of him, would greet you with such a charming cordiality that you felt as if you did him a favour by your visit. In the evenings after supper it was his wont to hold a little levée of his special friends. It was easy then by an adroit question to draw him out on reminiscences of the past, and it was impossible to hear him speak of the striking adventures he had passed through, of the popes and heroes whom he had intimately known, of the varied fortunes of the abbey he loved so passionately, without catching some sparks of the fire of his own enthusiasm.⁴²

Tosti was the last representative of the group of liberals of 1848 who tried to unite the "New Italy" under the papacy. He has been called the noblest expression of the generation of patriots who worked to form the Italian conscience, maintaining to the last an ardent and impetuous spirit, for he seemed gifted with eternal hope and youth. "He had such great confidence in the direct force of the good and the true, that difficulties and obstacles disappeared before his eyes. What to others appeared insoluble, to him was always possible of solution through a synthesis of reason and charity. . . . This ideal of peace and conciliation he had attained in the depths of his conscience by the nobility of his thoughts and the ardor of his faith."⁴³

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, October 16, 1859. Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, p. 72. Tosti was made titular abbot of St. Angelo de Gaeta in 1858. C. A. "Dom Louis Tosti," *Revue Benedictine*, XV, 65. He had refused the Chair of History at the University of Pisa out of deference to the wishes of the pope. Leo XIII had made him vice-archivist at the Vatican.

⁴¹ Leo XIII gave a considerable sum toward the project. Tosti also completed his *Life of St. Benedict* during these last years. He liked to compare the Benedictine Order to an oak tree which, being pruned again and again, comes out stronger than ever. His motto *Succisa Virescit*, was used on the coat of arms of the abbey.

⁴² Bede Camm, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

⁴³ Jules Gay, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

"Here another great subject opens upon us . . . I mean the endemic perennial fidget which possesses us about giving scandal; facts are omitted in great histories, or glosses are put upon memorable acts, because they are thought not edifying, whereas of all scandals such omissions, such glosses are the greatest."—*Newman*.

Some Recent Books on Russia

Anthony F. Czajkowski

Saint Louis University

Russia and Europe, 1789-1825, by Andrei A. Lobanov-Rostovsky, Durham. Duke University Press. 1947. pp. xviii, 448. \$5.00

Readings in Russian History. Edited by Warren B. Walsh. Syracuse. Syracuse University Press. 1948. pp. xiv, 549. \$5.00

The Origins of Modern Russia, by Jan Kucharzewski. New York. The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. 1948. pp. xix, 503. \$5.00

Russia in Flux, by Sir John Maynard. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1948. pp. xviii, 564. \$

The Development of the Soviet Economic System. An Essay on the Experience of Planning in the U. S. S. R. by Alexander Baykov. New York, The MacMillan Company. 1947. pp. xv, 514. \$6.00. (The National Institute of Economic and Social Research. Economic and Social Studies, No. 5.)

In recent years the printing presses have been turning out an ever-increasing number of scholarly, semi-scholarly and popular publications on Russia, both Tsarist and Communist, as journalists, economists, sociologists, historians, political scientists, and hosts of others have attempted to understand and perhaps to solve the question of the Soviet state. Most writers deal with the current scene, but some scholars have turned back to Tsarist history to understand the roots of the present and to draw parallels with the past.

I. In his book Professor Lobanov-Rostovsky of Michigan University attempts to give an account of the important part played by Russia in the affairs of Europe during and after the crisis produced by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era. By 1789 Russia was reaching the height of her power and prestige as Catherine the Great was bringing to a successful completion the projects begun almost a century before by Peter the Great. By shrewd diplomacy and successful warfare Russia had become a great European power and was prepared and able to devote full attention to matters of general European policy. Thus, when the French Revolution and the chain of wars which it engendered engulfed Europe, Russia became not only a participant but also a leading actor in the turbulent affairs of the time. Almost immediately Catherine took advantage of the involvement of Prussia and Austria in western Europe to complete her ambitious policy in Poland. Following her death, Paul I took Russia into the Second Coalition, and his army, commanded by the great General Suvorov almost turned the military tide against the French Directory. But Austrian and English self-interests caused Paul to forsake the coalition and to join forces with Napoleon. The *coup* which removed him from the Russian throne in favor of Alexander I reoriented Russian foreign policy, and there unfolded the tortuous policy which took Russia into the Third Coalition, reversed itself at Tilsit and finally caused the rupture which resulted in Napoleon's attack in 1812.

The events of 1812 and 1813 elevated Alexander I into the pre-eminent position in European politics and enabled him to shape the events which resulted in the destruction of Napoleon and the creation of a new Europe at Vienna. But the heretofore liberal Tsar was soon won over to the side of Metternich and became henceforth one of the bulwarks of European conservatism. This policy he transmitted to his successor, Nicholas I, who became, after 1825, the real leader of the conservative alliance in Europe.

Due to Alexander's efforts, a state of temporary equilibrium had been reached by 1825. Throughout his reign this enigmatic Tsar had followed two main purposes: first, to enhance the power and prestige of Russia, and secondly, to strive for permanent stability and order in the whole of Europe. The author notes that even though Alexander had dominated the scene of European diplomacy for only a short period, his genius consisted in never losing sight of Europe as a whole. In fact, the Tsar was bitterly criticized in Russia for sacrificing the interests of his country to the wider concept of peace and the maintenance of order in Europe. However, even while he was occupied in foreign affairs Alexander had not forsaken Russian affairs, as is witnessed by the legacy of accumulated power and prestige he left to his successor.

Because the emphasis is upon one country, a rather distorted picture is obtained of the contributions of the other participants in the wars. Prussia emerges as a weak and insignificant country, a satellite of Russia, while Austria, jealous of growing Russian power, is portrayed as a scheming, unreliable ally, ever at odds with Alexander.

The two main defects of the book are the sources used and the lack of maps. The author presents no new facts nor any new line of analysis or research on the period. His information is based for the most part on secondary material, especially on the works of Sorel and Vandal. Many of the books which he quotes for reference are old and have been supplanted by more recent works. Many books, moreover, which one would expect to find in a treatment of this period are not included. For instance, R. H. Lord's analysis of the diplomatic aspects of the Second Partition of Poland and the studies of the Soviet historian Tarle on the Napoleonic invasion of Russia are not mentioned.

Furthermore, the book does not contain a single map. For a better understanding of the many territorial changes which occurred in this period, and for appreciation of the tactics and the strategy of the battles which the author describes in great detail, a few maps would have been of great value.

Despite these limitations, the book has much to recommend it. It is written in a smooth, easy and clear style and presents a comprehensive picture of Russia's role in European affairs in the years of revolution and reaction.

II. The teacher of history is often confronted with the problem of making available to his students specific readings to supplement lectures and textbooks. In the field of Russian history the task becomes quite difficult,

for few libraries are well enough supplied to offer a comprehensive bibliography for thorough study.

Warren B. Walsh, Professor of History and Chairman of Russian Studies at Syracuse University, has attempted to compile a series of selections from primary and secondary sources to present the high-lights of the history of the Russian people. As usual in a work of this type, the primary task of the compiler is to posit some criterion by which the selections should be made. The criterion adopted by Professor Walsh is that of emphasizing social norms and values of the various periods, "how the people lived, how they fed and clothed themselves, their habits, their customs and their prejudices." He includes also the institutions of serfdom, the state, the administration and the church. Since the stress is on social and economic conditions, political and military affairs receive little attention. The book contains numerous selections on the life of the serfs and peasants, sometimes to the point of repetition.

The book is divided into six parts: I. Ancient and Medieval Times; II. The Rise of Muscovy; III. The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries; IV. The Reigns of Alexander I and Nicholas I; V. The Reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III; VI. The Road to Revolution. Since the author feels that there has been enough material published and easily available on the period since the Bolshevik seizure of power in November, 1917, he has set as his terminal date the March Revolution. Thus his selections cover the period from the origins of the Russian people to the Bolshevik regime.

Each selection is preceded by a short editorial statement concerning the author or the general setting. Appended to each of the six parts is a list of additional readings on the period covered, with page and chapter assignments.

The book will be of service both to students and to teachers, for it brings within the covers of one book selections from representative of various centuries who give eye-witness accounts of their observations at the tsarist court and among the people. Although for a course on the history of Russia, a final part on the growth of the Soviet State would have increased the book's serviceability; the author has nevertheless fulfilled his aim of presenting a composite picture of the Russian people at work, at play, at prayer and finally in revolution.

III. Jan Kucharzewski attempts to show that the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 was but the natural culmination of the long history of Russia and that both the despotic Tsarist government and the revolutionary trends of the nineteenth century contributed to the end result. The present work is a condensation of the author's work in seven volumes entitled *Od bialego caratu do czerwonego* (From White Tsardom to Red), published in 1923-1935. Three additional volumes were ready for publication in 1939 but the author's Warsaw home, containing his library and his notes, was totally destroyed during the German siege of the city and the additional volumes were never published. The unpublished volumes were to have dealt with the

reign of Nicholas II and with the events leading up to November, 1917.

The present work, therefore, concentrates on the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Kucharzewski presents a very incisive and at times brilliant analysis of Russian thought in this period, and it is unfortunate that he could not have traced its continuity through the turn of the century into the twentieth century. Presently, the book comes almost to an abrupt conclusion and less than half a chapter is devoted to the actual architects of the Bolshevik Revolution.

Kucharzewski, in trying to understand the Bolshevik phenomenon, concentrates upon the Russian mind as represented in the various classes of the population. Under the provoking title of "the Candle of Ivan Kalita" he traces the evolution of the Tsarist mentality from the early dukes of Moscow who had as their main task the expansion of their state. The incorporation of new territories went hand in hand with the constant growth of the power of the Dukes, the later Tsars. The might of the state became inseparably connected with the unlimited power of the Tsar.

At the other extreme was the vast silent ignorant mass of peasants, which, tied to the soil, persisted in its primitive state. The tsarist system tied its existence to the ignorance of the masses, in the belief that the education of the masses would be its death sentence. Tsardom, therefore, preserved barbarism, while barbarism perpetuated tyranny as the proper form of the state with a barbarian people. But tyranny creates a negation of state and law, a spontaneous anarchism among the masses. Only external compulsion and despotism could keep such a people in subjection. The slightest breach in the wall of despotism was bound to bring about a catastrophe, as the people would throw off all restraint.

Between the ruling caste at the top and the peasants at the bottom, there existed the restless intelligentsia, the men who recognized the shortcomings of their country's social, economic and political life and who attempted to find solutions for the deficiencies. Banished from the country, most of the Russian revolutionaries conducted their activity and writing abroad. But curiously, although they worked for the overthrow of the tsarist system, the Russian revolutionaries retained many of the old attributes of office. "By some fatality the kingdom of the future is unconsciously patterned after tsardom." Moreover, from the beginning the revolutionaries adopted the orthodox Muscovite Slavophilism and translated it into Russian revolutionary messianism. Russia alone could regenerate the decrepit and rotten West, and this revolutionary Russia would assume the leadership of the world movement. From Russia, according to Bakunin, would come the signal for renewing the world. The author believes that Bakunin rather than Marx was the real prophet of the Bolshevik revolution. According to Marx, social revolution was to take place after the capitalist evolution had reached its culmination. Bakunin's aim was not the culmination of capitalism but the interruption of its development by a revolution carried out in time.

Thus Bakunin anticipated the spirit, the nature and the phraseology of the Soviet regime.

Another inheritance from nineteenth century revolutionary Russian thought was the idea of revolutionary imperialism. Russia would regenerate the world, and it therefore had the duty of drawing other peoples into the orbit of the system, rejuvenating and perfecting mankind for their own good. Thus did the Soviets inherit the tsarist instincts of conquest. The revolutionaries and Tsars had much in common, not least being the faith in their own Rome, tsarist or Red, always dominating the world, the third Rome of old Moscow.

The author devotes a considerable portion of his book to Poland; he justifies his emphasis of Polish affairs on the basis that Poland was the laboratory for the tsarist policy of Russification and evoked from Russian revolutionaries their attitude on the treatment of non-Russian peoples once the revolution had been attained.

In the tsarist despotism and imperialism, in the barbarism of the people and in Russian revolutionary thought (which unconsciously adopted most of the tsarist policies) Kucharzewski sees the roots of the upheaval in 1917. The Soviet regime, therefore, is not a foreign importation, but a despotism inherent in the Russian nature.

IV. In direct contrast with the viewpoint of Kucharzewski is the work of Sir John Maynard. The book is an abridgement by S. Haden Guest of two earlier works by Maynard entitled "Russian in Flux" and "The Russian Peasant and Other Studies," with a foreword by Sir Bernard Pares. In the first portion of his book Maynard covers, in briefer form, much the same material that Kucharzewski does, but he draws substantially different conclusions. For instance, where the Polish writer interprets Marxian socialism as being based on the principle of the inexorable struggle of the social classes, in which the bourgeoisie is fated for destruction by the historical process, Maynard adhered to the belief that Marxism, as interpreted by the Bolsheviks, emphasizes the freedom of man. Communism is the only way of escape from capitalism's inability to provide a good life for its wage-earners. Marxism in this form is a call to man to make his own history. Man is not bound to a pitilessly revolving wheel, but can contribute to the making of his own history.

The author, a member of the Fabian Society, repeatedly justifies Soviet actions by citing shortcomings of the capitalist system. The thesis of his study is that freedom is divided between the Western democracies and the U. S. S. R., the former having political freedom and the latter economic freedom. He believes that of the two freedoms, the economic is the more desirable and that the Russian people have attained economic security and economic and social leveling in large measure. He contrasts their success with the imagined political freedom of the workers in capitalist countries who are ever in fear of unemployment and economic insecurity. His viewpoint is summed up on p. 416:

But, if we desire that kind of liberty which consists in economic

urity, we must, it would seem, be prepared to sacrifice that kind of liberty which consists in doing what we please at the cost of economic security. Perhaps there is no such thing as doing what we please, except upon a basis of pecuniary independence. It is one of the middle-class illusions, which do not deceive the man who depends upon the wage of his daily labour.

The book is a product of the "honeymoon" period of Soviet relations with the western powers, 1941-1945, when it was popular to praise the "democratic" Russian ally and to ignore or to tone down the more grant actions of the regime. Maynard accepts the principle that since Soviet Russia was able to withstand the German attack, its system is good and its methods successful. Therefore all means towards the attainment of the successful system must also have been good.

Omission of some of these means might have been as hypocritical as the attempts to justify unpleasant facts. To enumerate all the points with which issue might be taken would involve needless space, but a few instances can be mentioned. Perhaps the most flagrant instances occur in the references to the functions of the political police, the Gay-Pay-oo. On page 282 Maynard writes:

From 1929 it had the new function of organizing penal labour in the building of canals and railways and other work carried out by the agency of deported persons. In this capacity it established friendly relations with its prisoners, and one of the paradoxes of recent Russian history has been the release of many prisoners, and the decoration of some of them who had done good work under its auspices in the building of the Baltic-White Sea Canal, and of the Far Eastern Railway.

In view of the fairly well substantiated information which has been emanating from Russia concerning the employment of slave labor, estimated to number twelve to twenty million persons, it can hardly be said that relations have been human or friendly.

Even less comment is necessary on Sir Maynard's explanation of the role and of the purpose of the Third International. Through the Third International, he seriously observes, the Soviet government hopes that the world will become Communist, as the Pope trusts that it will become Catholic, but the result is to be attained not by subversion but by conversion. Communism is to conquer by its superior productivity.

The best portion of the book is that which presents the background of the Soviet regime. Once the author commences to analyze the events since 1917, the work becomes an apologia for the actions of the leaders. There is printed a picture of a happy, contented people, of beautiful rich lands and of a successful reaching for workers' Utopia upon earth. To draw this picture the author is prone to make general statements unsupported by facts and to employ *a priori* arguments why certain things are good or at least why they cannot be bad. Most of his information is derived from official publications, e. g., reports of congresses, laws, regulations, etc., and he is inclined to believe that the mere passage of a resolution immediately means its translation into reality. It is unfortunate that the unrealistic attitude toward Russia in 1941 and 1942, when the bulk of the book was written, has allowed the author to color his sympathies to so great an extent. Were Sir Maynard alive today an immediate revision would probably be his first wish. Since 1945 some doubts

might have arisen in his mind about the democratic character of the Soviet Union, economic or political, and of its passive role in foreign affairs.

V. In the final book under consideration the economic development of the U. S. S. R. and of the Soviet system is analyzed. The author recognizes that the development has not followed a consistent policy, but in fact has varied from period to period, sometimes to the point of contradiction. To understand the varied aspects of the economic life since 1917, the author has divided his study into four definite stages of development: 1. the transition period, 2. the period of the New Economic Policy, 3. the period of rationing, and 4. the period which began with the abolition of rationing and was brought to an end by the outbreak of war. In each period the government had certain specific aims and used whatever measures were necessary to attain those aims.

The book, written by an economist, is well fortified with statistics, tables, charts, etc. It is based almost entirely upon Soviet statistics and sources, but the author justifies his employment of these sources on the basis that by long experience he has found these sources to be as reliable as those issued by any other country.

From an economic viewpoint the progress of Soviet Russia from the chaos of 1917 has been remarkable. Inheriting a bankrupt nation, a paralyzed economy, the Bolsheviks, by methods of trial and error, not only restored agriculture and industry, but even launched a great program to transform their country from a predominantly agricultural economy to an industrial economy. To accomplish this task among a relatively ignorant people, without foreign loans or aid, was a task which called for mobilizing all the assets, human and material, in the country. Total mobilization of goods and manpower meant the disregard of the individual interests for the sake of the final goal. Were the historian interested merely in the statistics and accomplishments, and were he able to disregard the means employed, he would be inclined to hail the Soviet experiment as one of the great phenomena of history.

Since the author depends almost entirely on government reports, and justifiably for they are the only figures available, it is conceivable that the entire economic picture cannot be presented. For instance, in his recent book on forced labor in Soviet Russia, Dallin emphasizes the part played by labor camps in the Five Year Plans. Of course the statistics of forced labor production would not find their way into official reports and hence would not be considered by the economist.

In substance, however, Baykov does present a clear account of the economic problems which beset the organizers of the Soviet state and the manner in which they were solved. Above all, there emerges from this book the realization of how completely the totalitarian state controls every facet of the nation's economic life. Since the political and social aspects of the Soviet regime cannot be understood without an appreciation of the economic factors, this book is strongly recommended for those interested in the history of Russia.

Book Reviews

The Political Theory of the Huguenots of the Dispersion, by Guy Howard Dodge. New York. Columbia University Press. 1947. pp. ix, 287. \$3.50

The sub-title of this solid, scholarly work is "With Special Reference to the Thought and Influence of Pierre Jurieu," a point which should be kept in mind by the reader, for Professor Dodge's book is chiefly a study of the political theory of Jurieu.

Jurieu was originally a professor at the Protestant Academy of Sedan, but after the publication of his second work in 1677, he fled France and set himself up as a Calvinist pastor and professor at Rotterdam. There he remained, writing and teaching, for the rest of his life. Jurieu was a fundamentalist theologian who lived in the age of Locke and Bayle, men who were considerably more "modern" and "advanced" in their thinking on religious and political problems.

Professor Dodge offers the first work in English dealing extensively and competently with the political thought of Jurieu and with his associates who were driven from France in the days of Louis XIV. His study quite properly centers around the key ideas of popular sovereignty and tolerance. It is a thorough, scholarly investigation which shows all over again how wrong it is to draw a straight line between John Calvin and modern ideas of popular sovereignty and tolerance. Professor Dodge shows how Jurieu's main concern was the establishment of his "true religion," and how he held for neither popular sovereignty nor tolerance, how, indeed, he unconsciously justified the revocation of the Edict of Nantes which he so bitterly condemned as intolerance. This work backs up the conclusion of John Neville Figgis that "reluctantly and in spite of themselves, religious societies were led by practical necessity to employ upon their own behalf doctrines which are now the common heritage of the Western World."

There are forty-four pages of bibliography appended to this study. A few words of criticism on each of the items with which the author is familiar would have made the bibliography much more useful for the student who wishes to pursue this interesting subject further. This is otherwise both a scholarly and a valuable study.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

The Faith of Reason, by Charles Frankel. New York. King's Crown Press, Columbia University. 1948. pp. x, 165. \$3.00

French *philosophes* of the eighteenth century are generally credited with the creation of what can be called "modern thought." Somewhat in the tradition of the late Carl Becker, the author of *The Faith of Reason* offers an independent and capable investigation of such *philosophes* as Condillac, Voltaire, Diderot, Condorcet and Rousseau.

Mr. Frankel centers his study around the idea of progress held by these leaders of the Enlightenment, an idea which leads him almost inevitably into their faith in science as the field in which reason works most

objectively. The chief value of this study lies in demonstrating how Cartesian standards and methods persisted long after the triumph of Locke's "plain historical method." Cartesianism as a system was rejected of course, but its legacy lay heavy on the entire eighteenth century, even into the French Revolution. No one has demonstrated this more clearly than Mr. Frankel.

The Faith of Reason is a sympathetic treatment of these men of the Enlightenment—a surprising thing for this day when disillusionment in progress and in science is quite common among scholars. The author seems particularly fond of Diderot, whose restless mind refused to confine itself to any system of thought, whose shifting agnosticism refused to admit anything supernatural to it.

Mr. Frankel's study is good insofar as it is an independent investigation not influenced by the many older interpretations of the *philosophes*. It is weak in that it tends to read a good bit of today's mind—especially the author's—into these men of the Enlightenment whose thought on the idea of progress and its connection with science the book seeks to expose.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

France Alive, by Claire Huchet Bishop. New York. Declan X. McMullen Co. 1947. pp. xi, 227. \$3.00

This book is an account of post-war religious revival in France, notably among the proletariat, by a woman whose French birth and background make her an excellent observer. The movements which Mrs. Bishop describes started among the people during the occupation and continues now, as her two recent visits to France have shown her.

The experience of courageous priests and laymen who joined work-groups taken into Germany during the occupation has inspired two vigorous movements for re-Christianizing French workmen. One of these is a lay organization, the People's Family Movement, whose purpose is to foster neighborhood spirit and self-help. While this movement is not primarily religious since it aims to help people in all their needs, its members' zeal and charity have led many workers back to God. Equally significant is the apostolate of priest-workers, who take jobs in factories, wear workers' clothes, live in workers' quarters, and carry on the ministry among workers.

The JAC has been doing a comparable work in rural France, and in both town and country renewed interest in the Mass, the other liturgical functions and the Sacred Scriptures have given depth and strength to the renewal.

Further chapters report on the interesting industrial and social experiment of Boimondau, a Catholic factory-community near Lyons; religious revival among French protestants, including an account of the quasi-religious community at Cluny; French activities in the great oecumenical movement for reunion of Christendom; and vignettes of new religious communities living

the world according to the Benedictine, Dominican Carmelite rules.

Mrs. Bishops' survey of extraordinary religious revival among French workers might, despite her warning, give the impression that Catholicism among the bourgeois is altogether drab and moribund. It is regrettable that an additional chapter could not be devoted to the work of Catholic students, the work of the Legion of Mary, the Sodality of Our Lady and to the magnificent intellectual activity throughout France today.

But what Mrs. Bishop reports is well and inspiringly told.

FRANCIS J. CORLEY, S.J.

Japan's Influence on American Naval Power, 1897-1917, by Outten Jones Clinard. Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press. 1947. pp. iv, 235. \$3.75

It is unfortunate that this work, published as it was in 1947 instead of in 1927, must be more in the nature of an autopsy rather than analytic and remedial. Had it been available to the members of Congress and to the American people during the "cherry blossom-scarp" period of Japanese-American relations, there could certainly have been a more incisive interpretation of Japan's activity following the first war, and quite possibly there would have been no successful attack on Pearl Harbor. This book is not intended for alarm men, for they have no need of it; never since the beginning of the rise of modern Dai Nippon has the Navy been unaware of the threat in the Pacific, nor has it ever treated it as of little consequence. It is a book rather for the people of the United States and for representatives upon whom the Navy of a democratic nation must depend for its fighting strength and implementation of policy. Mr. Clinard has presented a clear, unencumbered, and thoroughly documented appraisal of Japan's practically unchecked expansion through aggression before and during the first World War which so clearly paralleled that preceding the outbreak of the second. The reader is left with the question why and how, once the United States had understood and faced up to the Japanese threat with the Naval Appropriation Act of 1916, it could have been lulled into the false security of isolationism and appeasement in the Far East which ended only with the tragedy of American graves dotting the Pacific.

There is no mention of tonnages, speeds, or armaments; Mr. Clinard's chief concern is not with what we were to have afloat under our flag, but why we were to have them, i. e., American commitments and interests—the Philippines, Guam, Hawaii, China—in the Far East and Japan's attitude towards them since the Sino-Japanese war. So successfully has he marshaled his facts and pointed up heretofore little appreciated relations, that almost from the beginning the reader is absorbed in judging and integrating these facts and conclusions as to become oblivious of style, diction, or presentation.

Perhaps the greatest virtue recommending the book is that it destroys the once popular tenet that the geographical field of American or European history, for practical purposes at least, should end at the inter-

national date line. Having read this book, the serious student can no longer tolerate others which depict Far Eastern history as something distinct and separate from that of Europe and the Americas. For today such books belong to the era of mercator geography and "ocean barrier" political thought. For those who have presumed that Japan's role in the first war was friendly to the allies, who before December 7, 1941, thought of Homer Lea and others who tried to warn us in time as fools and alarmists—for them Mr. Clinard has prepared a high calibre-high load bomb shell.

Under all considerations of evaluation—adherence to and development of central theme, documentation of controverted statements, bibliography (thirty-eight pages, with Russian, German and French sources), index, footnotes and general worth and interest, this work rates a Navy 4.0 and "Well done."

JOHN J. DAHLHEIMER.

Niles' Weekly Register, News Magazine of the Nineteenth Century, by Norval Neil Luxon. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1947. pp. viii, 337. \$5.00

Through most of the first half of the nineteenth century (1811-49), one of the newspapers which wielded considerable influence on local and national politics was *Niles' Weekly Register*. Through more recent days this periodical has become increasingly valued by the historian as a source of information on that same period.

Oddly enough, however, Mr. Luxon's volume is the first "biography" of this publication. Because of the importance of the newspaper itself, the book also assumes some importance.

The type of arrangement used by Mr. Luxon is topical rather than chronological, as he attempts to reflect, in relatively short space, the attitudes of the *Register* towards the issues of its day. These include, naturally, the bank and the tariff, Anglo-American relations, Latin-America, the west and internal improvements, slavery, and other lesser problems. The views of the paper on these topics are given clearly, briefly, and with full citations of the *Register* itself.

To his survey of the attitudes of the *Register*, the author has added a chapter on "The *Register* and the Historian," in which he stresses the value of his subject to the profession. To buttress his estimate of the value of the *Register* ("the most important contemporary source for its period available to the student today"), Mr. Luxon cites the esteem in which it was held by its contemporaries for its accuracy and comprehensive coverage as well as the widespread use of it made by later writers on the period.

A critical essay on authorities indicates, naturally, that the principal source is the *Register* itself, supplemented by an impressive array of primary and secondary sources. An excellent use of footnotes and a comprehensive index enhance the value of the book.

The author, now professor of journalism at Ohio State University, may well take pride in this revision of his doctoral dissertation.

J. W. CROSS, JR.

American Diplomacy and the War of the Pacific, by Herbert Millington. New York. Columbia University Press. 1948. pp. 172. \$2.50

Millington announces that the purpose of his small volume is to focus attention on a "neglected chapter in American diplomacy." His appraisal of the 1879-1883 War of the Pacific as a "neglected chapter" is entirely correct. The relations of the United States with the three warring powers (Chile, Peru and Bolivia) do represent a chapter in our diplomacy, half-buried and half-forgotten.

The problem that the author attacks concerns a war which as he points out, took place many years ago; but, significantly, that war, occurring in the early 80's, was contemporaneous with the embryonic beginnings of U. S.-sponsored Pan-Americanism.

The conclusion of Millington is that despite our "meddling and muddling" via our foreign policy—a policy obviously not burdened by consistency—there were constructive points in our diplomacy.

Want of space forbids more than a hasty analysis here of American policy during the Pacific War. At the outset, it might be well to observe that Uncle Sam, with the best of intentions, got his fingers burned in handling the three witches' brew—that war mess concocted by the Chilean, Peruvian and Bolivian "brewers."

Particularly in the third chapter does Millington begin to sink his teeth into meaty stuff. Here, after carefully distinguishing between intervention and mediation, he recounts how the Washington government in general followed a non-interventionist policy, whatever the momentary actions of our South American ministers. The "ever-present question of the Monroe Doctrine," however, prompted the government to take the lead in mediation in spite of the fact that our commercial interests in the area were far outweighed by those of the British and despite an early offer by Her Majesty's government to offer mediation. When Blaine replaced Evarts as Secretary of State (March, 1881), he inherited much of the latter's policy—i. e., the United States should mediate the quarrel. Blaine, though, changed technique, abandoning caution and becoming more "pugilistic." Blaine's general plans seemed well advised, but the handling of specific details (e. g., the appointment as ministers to Peru and Chile of two broken-down brass hats, Generals Kilpatrick and Hurlbut) wrecked any chances for real success. Finally, when Frelinghuysen replaced Blaine (December, 1881) our policy was again somewhat changed—but the new softer policy bore no better fruits. The war expended itself finally with Chile imposing the harsh treaty of Ancon, and the attempts by the United States to control the war's course or influence the peace thus ended without noticeable results.

In the last chapter Millington presents a good summary of the events and, happily, does not leave the reader suspended in air, but gives in the closing pages a few words on the post-lude to the War of the Pacific: namely, the Tacna-Arica dispute between Chile and Bolivia not settled till 1929.

CLIFFORD REUTTER.

Book Notices

American Political and Social History, by Harold Derwood Faulkner. Fifth edition. New York London. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1948. xxii, 954. \$5.00

This is a new edition of a text that has been famous since 1937. The author has used the fact that this volume had to be reset in order to revise the treatment. This reviewer notes with dismay that Mr. Faulkner preaches (p. 102) his very fuzzy and quite un-American concept of rights and the purposes of government. The single sentence, "Only in a limited sense, if at all, have men ever been created equal, nor are they endowed with any rights except those they can obtain and hold, nor were governments, in spite of certain American precedents, originated to secure these 'unalienable rights' " is enough to render other judgments and interpretations of the author suspect. This kind of thinking is no compliment to "twentieth-century historical and ethnological research." Such an interpretation of the American story is not to be recommended despite many fine features which the volume contains.

J. F. B.

A History of Colonial America, by Oliver Perry Chittenden. Second edition. New York. Harper Brothers, Publishers. 1948. pp. xix, 874.

An old favorite comes back in new dress, and with new trimmings. The first thirty-three chapters have been slightly reworked and the bibliographical data brought up to date. Two chapters have been added which carry the story to 1789. Some very fine illustrations have been inserted into this edition. The work needs no more commendation than that which its previous usefulness in the last two decades has won it.

J. F. B.

The Andes, by Marie Fischer. Maryknoll, N. Y. Maryknoll Bookshelf. 1948. \$1.50 per unit, complete in binder.

This forms Unit VII of the Maryknoll Teacher's series, study helps for teachers and young students who are interested in becoming acquainted with the other peoples of the globe and with the work of Catholic missionaries past and present in their behalf. The author tells, very excellently, "how the people of the Andes (Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru) live." Recommended for elementary and junior high levels.

J. F. B.

Books Received

Father Damien, Apostle of the Lepers, by Amleto Giovanni Cicognani. Washington. Fathers of the Sacred Heart. 1948. pp. 47. \$0.50

Conferences on the Sacred Heart. Proceedings of First National Congress of the Enthronement of Sacred Heart in the Home, St. Francis Major Seminary, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July, 1946. Washington. National Center of the Enthronement. 92. \$1.00

The True Concept of Literature, by Austin J. Applegate. D. San Antonio. The Mission Press. 1948. 110. \$1.00